

Adoption in Galatians and Romans

Biblical Interpretation Series

Editors in Chief

Paul Anderson (*George Fox University*)
Jennifer Koosed (*Albright College, Reading*)

Editorial Board

A.K.M. Adam (*University of Oxford*)
Roland Boer (*University of Newcastle, Australia*)
Colleen M. Conway (*Seton Hall University*)
Vernon Robbins (*Emory University*)
Annette Schellenberg (*Universität Wien*)
Carolyn J. Sharp (*Yale Divinity School*)
Johanna Stiebert (*University of Leeds*)
Duane Watson (*Malone University*)
Ruben Zimmermann (*Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz*)

VOLUME 153

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/bins

Adoption in Galatians and Romans

*Contemporary Metaphor Theories and the Pauline
Huiiothesia Metaphors*

By

Erin M. Heim



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <http://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Heim, Erin M., author.

Title: Adoption in Galatians and Romans : contemporary metaphor theories and
the Pauline huiiothesia metaphors / by Erin M. Heim.

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2017. | Series: Biblical interpretation
series, ISSN 0928-0731 ; VOLUME 153 | Includes bibliographical references
and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016054172 (print) | LCCN 2017001775 (ebook) | ISBN
9789004339866 (hardback : alk. paper) | ISBN 9789004339873 (E-book)

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Epistles of Paul—Criticism, interpretation, etc. |
Metaphor in the Bible. | Bible. Galatians—Criticism, interpretation, etc.
| Bible. Romans--Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Adoption
(Theology)—Biblical teaching.

Classification: LCC BS2655.M47 A36 2017 (print) | LCC BS2655.M47 (ebook) |
DDC 227/.1066—DC23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016054172>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0928-0731

ISBN 978-90-04-33986-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-33987-3 (e-book)

Copyright 2017 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and
Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system,
or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided
that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive,
Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

For my parents.

August 9, 1983



Contents

Acknowledgments XI

Abbreviations XII

1 Introduction 1

Previous Research: A Critical Overview 2

The Scope of This Project 17

Overview of Chapters 22

2 A Working Theory of Metaphor 24

Introduction 24

Meaning and Embodied Simulation 26

Metaphor: A Working Definition 29

Substitution or Comparison Theories 30

Contemporary Theories of Metaphor 33

Janet Martin Soskice: An Interanimation Theory of Metaphor 40

Metaphor and Exegesis 56

Text, Context, Intertextuality, and Metaphorical Meaning 57

Meaning is Indeterminate 66

Metaphor and Epistemology 69

Conclusion 73

3 Metaphor: Perception, Emotion, Intimacy, and Identity Formation 76

Introduction 76

Metaphor and the Individual 79

Metaphor and Perception 80

Metaphor and Emotion 88

Metaphor and Community 96

Metaphor and the Creation of Intimacy 97

Intimacy Between Author and Audience 97

Metaphor and Group Identity 104

Conclusion 111

4 Sketching the Model: The Background and Conventional Use of

νιοθεσία 112

Introduction 112

Conventional Meaning, Background, and Translation: Some
Methodological Considerations 116

	<i>The Conventional Meaning of υἱοθεσία</i>	117
	<i>Other Proposed Translations, Backgrounds, and Models</i>	122
Possible Models for υἱοθεσία		130
	<i>Jewish Background</i>	130
	<i>Greek Background</i>	135
	<i>Roman Background</i>	138
Conclusion		145
5 We have Received the Adoption to Sonship: The υἱοθεσία Metaphor in Galatians 4:5		148
Introduction		148
	<i>Introduction to the Exegetical Chapters</i>	148
	<i>Introduction to Galatians</i>	149
	<i>Galatians 4:5 in the Context of Galatians</i>	156
Metaphor and Text		164
	<i>The Metaphorical Utterance in Galatians 4:5</i>	164
	<i>The Frame: Galatians 4:1–7</i>	167
	<i>Model, Tenor, and Vehicle</i>	172
	<i>Emphasis and Resonance</i>	177
Metaphor and Audience		178
	<i>Metaphor and Perception</i>	179
	<i>Highlighting and Hiding</i>	183
	<i>Metaphor and Emotion</i>	188
	<i>Metaphor and Community</i>	194
Conclusion		198
6 We Ourselves Groan Inwardly: The υἱοθεσία Metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 8:23		200
Introduction		200
	<i>Paul's Audience in Rome</i>	202
	<i>Romans 8:15–23: Preliminary Exegetical Issues</i>	204
Metaphor and Text		210
	<i>The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 8:15 and 8:23</i>	210
	<i>Models, Tenors, and Vehicles</i>	213
	<i>The Frame: Romans 8:12–25</i>	222
	<i>Emphasis and Resonance</i>	224

Metaphor and Audience	226
<i>Metaphor and Perception</i>	227
<i>Metaphor and Emotion</i>	237
<i>Metaphor and Community</i>	244
Conclusion	248
 7 To Whom Belongs the Adoption: The υἱοθεσία Metaphor in Romans 9:4	251
Introduction	251
Metaphor and Text	253
<i>The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 9:4</i>	253
<i>Tenor and Vehicle</i>	258
<i>The Frame: Romans 9:1–5</i>	263
<i>The Emphasis and Resonance of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4</i>	264
Metaphor and Intertextuality in Romans 9:4	267
<i>The Old Testament Literature</i>	273
<i>The Intertestamental Literature</i>	280
<i>Paul's "Reflection" of the Sonship Tradition</i>	293
Metaphor and Audience	302
<i>Metaphor and Perception</i>	303
<i>Metaphor and Emotion</i>	309
<i>Metaphor and Community</i>	313
Conclusion	320
 8 Toward a Synthesis of the υἱοθεσία Metaphors	321
Concluding Summary and Synthesis	321
<i>The Contribution of Each Chapter</i>	321
<i>Toward a Synthesis</i>	325
Pauline Theology and the Hermeneutics of Metaphor	329
<i>Identifying Metaphors in the Pauline Text</i>	329
<i>Intertextual Connections in Metaphorical Utterances</i>	331
<i>Metaphor and Model in Pauline Theology</i>	332
<i>Metaphor and Theological Categories</i>	333
 Bibliography	335
Index of Modern Authors	363
Index of Ancient Sources	369

Acknowledgments

The impetus to research and write a study on the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors came from a deeply personal and joyful, yet sometimes difficult, part of my life experience as an adopted child. There are numerous people who have been sources of encouragement throughout this process in the truest sense of the word—those whose support has given me the courage to delve not only into intensive research, but also within myself, to complete this study.

My doctoral supervisors, Paul Trebilco and Lynne Baab, who never spared me the difficult questions. You two are outstanding.

My fellow students at the University of Otago, and my colleagues at Denver Seminary, especially Elodie Emig and David Mathewson, whose insights often illuminated possibilities I would have never considered on my own. More than that, whose friendship and camaraderie, morning teas, impromptu lunches, trips to Jake's, and many discussions have made this journey richer.

My friends in Dunedin and Denver, whose timely words of encouragement spurred me on at several critical moments during the research process. I especially want to mention the women in my bible study in Dunedin and my colleagues in the Biblical Studies division at Denver Seminary, who each modeled for me the integration of faith and academics.

Lastly, words cannot express my gratitude for my family's support. To my extended Colorado family, Elodie and Peter Tiberius Emig, you are a tremendous gift to us, and a living testimony to how strong the bonds of chosen family can be. To my husband, Peter, who was my faithful companion during many long walks where together we mulled over my research. I truly could not have done this without you. To my two children, Elise and Finn, who were both born during the course of writing this book, you have taught me the depth of the riches of the Father's love for us; I am privileged to be your mother. Lastly, to my parents, Paul and Marcia, who adopted me and took me as their own. We are all the lucky ones.

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
AER	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i>
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentary
AsTJ	<i>Asbury Theological Journal</i>
BBR	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation
BSac	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
DBAT	Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche
EA	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FAT II	Forschungen zum Alten Testament Series II
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum neuen Testament
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
HvTSt	<i>Hervormde teologise studies</i>
IG II ²	<i>Inscriptiones atticae Euclidis anno anteriores</i>
ITQ	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBMW	<i>Journal of Biblical Manhood and Womanhood</i>

<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LA</i>	<i>Liber Annuus</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>MScRel</i>	<i>Mélanges de science religieuse</i>
NDT	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTL	New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>RelSRev</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>SBET</i>	<i>Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology</i>
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBT II	Studies in Biblical Theology: Series II
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SP	Sacra Pagina
<i>SPAW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT II	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II

WW	<i>Word and World</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

Introduction

Author Bernard Malamud quipped, “I love metaphor. It provides two loaves where there seems to be one. Sometimes it throws in a load of fish.”¹ Metaphor is a powerful and mysterious tool of communication, one which permeates everyday language and pervades great literature, both sacred and profane. Research in diverse fields such as philosophy of language, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, communication and rhetoric, and anthropology has shown metaphor to be an integral and influential component of the conceptual framework created by language, and both writers and appreciators of metaphor attribute the potency of metaphor to its enigmatic ability to “provide two loaves where there seems to be one.” Malamud’s enthusiasm, which is echoed by so many other writers and theorists, should motivate Pauline scholars to be enamored with metaphor and its ability to miraculously transform and multiply images and meanings. However, given the analytical framework of much of biblical exegesis, interpreters perhaps too often meet metaphor with a sort of suspicious “anti-supernaturalism” and tend to strip a metaphor of its mysterious qualities in an attempt to map out its precise or “literal” meaning.

One of the chief aims of this study is to examine four occurrences of *υιοθεσία* (adoption)² metaphors in the undisputed Pauline epistles (Gal 4:5, Rom 8:15; Rom 8:23; Rom 9:4) with the expressed intention of uncovering and appreciating elements of biblical metaphors that are often treated as superfluous to its “meaning.”³ Previous studies on the *υιοθεσία* metaphors have tended to focus on the question of background and occasionally on their theological significance in the Pauline corpus. However, little consideration has been given to how precisely the various proposals for the background of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors relate to the question of the metaphors’ meaning, or meanings, within the Pauline letters. Although this question may seem self-evident, research

1 Daniel Stern, “The Art of Fiction LII: Bernard Malamud,” *The Paris Review* 61 (1975): 52.

2 The word *υιοθεσία* will appear untranslated throughout this book. This word is most commonly translated “adoption,” but I have chosen to leave the word untranslated in order to leave space for the multiple models which underlie the metaphors.

3 The *υιοθεσία* (adoption) metaphor in Eph 1:5 will not be treated for two reasons: (1) the metaphor occurs in the context of a prayer rather than within the main argument of the letter, (2) concerns over authorship and audience make situating the text within a historical context more difficult.

from other disciplines suggests that reading metaphors is not necessarily a straightforward process. Rather, metaphorical meaning is produced through an intricate dance between background and context, between metaphor and model. Moreover, insights from other disciplines have shown that metaphors communicate much more than mere cognitive content, and often serve a psychosocial function as well. In light of the advances in contemporary metaphor theory, the goal of this study is to wrestle with the question of how the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors⁴ work to create meaning, perception, emotion, and a sense of group identity for their original audiences.

Previous Research: A Critical Overview

Relevant previous research for this study falls under two main subcategories: research in Pauline studies which utilizes contemporary metaphor theory, and specific and targeted research on the Pauline occurrences of *υιοθεσία*. However, to date no study has utilized a methodology drawn from current theories of metaphor in order to exegete the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans and Galatians. Moreover, there is room for refinement and expansion of the method for treating Pauline metaphors more generally, in light of several neglected areas of research in metaphor theory. Indeed, much of the current discussion of several of Paul's key metaphors—most notably justification—operates with almost no awareness or engagement with current theories of metaphor. To be certain, some might object that key Pauline terms, such as *δικαιοσύνη* (righteousness) or *ἀπολύτρωσις* (redemption) are not metaphorical at all, and thus should not be subjected to a methodology like the one I propose in this study. However, perhaps this objection is grounded in the reluctance to label something “metaphorical” for fear that this label relegates the content of the metaphor to a lower level of truth. In other words, if *δικαιοῦν* (to justify) is metaphorical, then God does not *actually* justify, but only “metaphorically” justifies. Yet in the methodological portion of this study, I will show that metaphors do not communicate truths of a lesser order, but rather they communicate truths of the same order as “literal” statements. Most importantly, metaphors communicate truths that cannot be communicated in any other way. As I will show, metaphors are not entirely paraphrasable, and their resistance to literal paraphrase makes them well suited for communicating profound theological truths.

4 I will refer to the “*υιοθεσία* metaphors” rather than the “*υιοθεσία* metaphor” in order to emphasize that these metaphors are not easily synthesized into a univocal meaning. A detailed explanation will be given in later in this chapter.

As such, incorporating insights from other disciplines that aim to explain what metaphors are, and how metaphors work, could significantly advance current discussions surrounding other Pauline metaphors, in addition to facilitating the analysis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors treated in this study.

Studies on Other Pauline Metaphors which Utilize Contemporary Metaphor Theory

In recent years, in addition to the growing number of publications that utilize metaphor theory for the exegesis of biblical texts,⁵ several studies on specific Pauline metaphors have emerged containing varying levels of engagement with current theories of metaphor. In terms of their engagement with modern theories of metaphor, four of the most notable studies include Nijay Gupta's, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul*,⁶ Gregory Dawes's, *The Body in Question*,⁷ Reidar Aasgaard's, "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!,"⁸ and Beverly Roberts Gaventa's, *Our Mother Saint Paul*.⁹ Of the four studies, Gupta's monograph, at its surface, seems to offer the most integrated approach to the Pauline metaphors. Gupta's methodology utilizes the theories of Janet Martin Soskice,¹⁰ and George Lakoff and Mark Johnson,¹¹ drawing both from philosophical approaches and cognitive approaches to metaphor in order to analyze and map Paul's "non-atonement cultic metaphors."¹² However, although Gupta's approach

- 5 Several examples of studies with thorough and meticulous approaches to metaphor include Allison Gray, *Psalm 118 in Words and Pictures* (BibInt 127, Leiden: Brill, 2013); Hanne Løland, *Silent or Salient Gender?: The Interpretation of Gendered God-Language in the Hebrew Bible Exemplified in Isaiah 42, 46, and 49* (FAT II 32, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Bonnie Howe, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter* (BibInt 81, Leiden: Brill, 2006); Alec Basson, *Divine Metaphors in Selected Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation* (FAT II 32, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Nelly Stienstra, *YHWH Is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993); Marc Zvi Brettler, *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor* (JSOTSup 76, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).
- 6 Nijay Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNT 175, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010).
- 7 Gregory W. Dawes, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21–33* (BibInt 30, Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- 8 Reidar Aasgaard, "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!": *Christian Siblingship in Paul* (JSNTSup 265, London: T & T Clark, 2004).
- 9 Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville: WJK, 2007).
- 10 Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).
- 11 George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).
- 12 Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul*, 4.

utilizes key theorists from varying approaches to metaphor, his engagement with them in the exegetical portion of his monograph is limited. Moreover, his characterization of “metaphorizing” as “the comparison of something (like the people of God) to something else (like the temple),”¹³ which is foundational to his study, is in direct conflict with Soskice’s own views on metaphor and thus raises serious questions about his level of engagement with her material.¹⁴ Although Gupta’s study does begin to utilize cross-disciplinary metaphor theories for the exegesis and interpretation of Pauline texts, his methodology leaves room for expansion and improvement.

Among current studies of metaphors in the Pauline corpus, Dawes’s study stands out for its methodological rigor. Using a philosophical approach to language and metaphor, Dawes evaluates the theories of I. A. Richards,¹⁵ Max Black,¹⁶ and Monroe Beardsley,¹⁷ also drawing heavily on the work of Soskice. In his introduction, Dawes identifies a primary weakness among most exegetical investigations of biblical metaphors: the lack of “sensitivity to the nature and functioning of metaphorical language.”¹⁸ Dawes’s study seeks to rectify this lack of sensitivity by thoughtfully employing a contemporary philosophical theory of metaphor in a close reading of the body metaphor in Ephesians, and his exegesis reflects a deep understanding of the philosophical and literary complexities of the theories with which he engages. However, Dawes’s methodology does not seek to address a metaphor’s impact on extra-linguistic features, such as cognition, perception, emotion, and identity. These elements, which would undoubtedly complement Dawes’s excellent literary and philosophical analysis, are incorporated into the methodological approach of this study alongside insights from philosophical and literary theories.

Drawing from contemporary cognitive theories on metaphor, Aasgaard’s methodology represents a needed complement to Dawes’s work. Aasgaard relies heavily on well-known cognitive theorists such as Lakoff and Johnson, Mark Turner,¹⁹ and Black. Aasgaard views metaphor as “an understanding/

13 Ibid., 2.

14 Soskice’s definition will be discussed at length in the next chapter.

15 I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).

16 Max Black, “More About Metaphor,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 19–41; idem, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1962).

17 Monroe Beardsley, “The Metaphorical Twist,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 293–307.

18 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 16.

19 George Lakoff, and Mark Turner, *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989); see also Mark Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism* (Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2000).

experience, which has been transferred from one area to another,” and utilizes Lakoff and Johnson’s terminology of “source” and “target” to map insights from the source domain, “siblingship in antiquity,” onto the target, “Christian relations.”²⁰ Aasgaard’s methodology and exegesis underscore key features of metaphor, such as their ability to shape perception and to highlight and hide elements of their subjects, but his engagement with metaphor as a literary device is less rigorous.²¹ A comprehensive approach to metaphor in the biblical text must seek to treat both its linguistic and extra-linguistic elements.

Gaventa’s study on the maternal metaphors in the Pauline letters includes insights from several other important contributors to contemporary metaphor theory, most notably Ted Cohen and Wayne Booth.²² Gaventa argues that Cohen’s work, which focuses on how metaphors cultivate intimacy, elucidates how biblical authors can employ metaphors in order to achieve non-cognitive objectives, such as reestablishing relationships or creating connections between author and audience.²³ Similarly, Gaventa draws upon Booth’s insights regarding a metaphor’s persuasive capabilities which require “a decision on the part of the hearer or reader.”²⁴ Upon hearing or reading a metaphor, the audience must decide to either join in understanding the metaphor or resist the author’s invitation. In her exegesis of the Pauline maternal metaphors, Gaventa uses Booth’s work to highlight the social and paraenetic functions of the Pauline maternal metaphors alongside their theological content. Gaventa’s identification of the capacity of biblical metaphor to cultivate intimacy between author and audience represents a most interesting augmentation to other methodologies where the metaphor’s cognitive content is of prime concern. However, the work of Cohen and Booth is largely theoretical, and Gaventa’s methodology can now be supplemented by several quantitative studies that demonstrate the kinds of bonds between speakers that result

20 Aasgaard, “*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*,” 26.

21 E.g., Aasgaard states, “The presence of a metaphor can be indicated syntactically, by ‘as,’ ‘like,’ and so on. . . . But it may just as well be recognizable only semantically” (ibid., 26). Aasgaard’s statement betrays a common misconception that adding a comparative term does not change the meaning of a metaphor; this will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

22 Ted Cohen, “Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy,” in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 1–10; see also idem, *Thinking of Others: On the Talent for Metaphor* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Wayne Booth, “Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation,” in *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 47–70; see also idem, *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

23 Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 11–12.

24 Ibid., 11.

from the use of metaphor.²⁵ Moreover, Gaventa's methodology would also be enriched by an examination of the effect of metaphor on the emotions of the hearer or reader, which is integrated alongside the insights from Cohen and Booth in the methodological portion of this study.

Studies on the Pauline υιοθεσία Metaphors

In addition to a number of articles and short studies on the Pauline υιοθεσία passages and their background,²⁶ six key monographs have been written in the field of biblical studies since 1979 that have critically examined the background and exegetical significance of the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline corpus:

25 This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

26 Shorter background studies focusing on the Jewish background of the term include: William H. Russell, "New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic," *JBL* 50 (1931): 186–200; James I. Cook, "The Concept of Adoption in the Theology of Paul," in *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, ed. Brendan Byrne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 133–44; Martin Schoenberg, "Huiiothesia: The Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites," *AER* 143 (1960): 261–73. Shorter background studies focusing on Greco-Roman law and practice include: James C. Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2003), 42–76; Francis Lyall, "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption," *JBL* 88 (1969): 458–66; idem, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984), 67–99; Kathleen Corley, "Women's Inheritance Rights in Antiquity and Paul's Metaphor of Adoption," in *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine (Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2004), 98–121. Shorter studies focused on theological interpretation or hermeneutical concerns include: Michael Peppard, "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship," *CBQ* 73 (2011): 92–110; Trevor Burke, "Adopted as Sons (ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ): The Missing Piece in Pauline Soteriology," in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 259–87; idem, "Pauline Adoption: A Sociological Approach," *EvQ* 73 (2001): 119–34; idem, "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8," *EvQ* 70 (1998): 311–24; George C. Gianoulis, "Is Sonship in Romans 8:14–17 a Link with Romans 9?," *BSac* 166 (2009): 70–83; Antonio Aranda, "Imagen de Dios en Christo—Hijos de Dios en Christo: Una Relectura de la Doctrina Antropológica Paulina," *Scripta Theologica* 39.1 (2007): 37–72; Tim Trummer, "A Fresh Exposition of Adoption: An Outline," *SBET* 23.1 (2005): 60–80; idem, "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption: A Plea for Realisation I: The Adoption Metaphor in Biblical Usage," *SBET* 14 (1996): 129–45; Bernard Rey, "Vie de foi et vie filiale selon Saint Paul," *MScRel* 39.1 (1982): 3–18; Alfio Marcello Buscemi, "Libertà e Huiiothesia: Studio Esetico di Gal 4,1–7," *LA* 30 (1980): 93–136; Daniel J. Theron, "'Adoption' in the Pauline Corpus," *EvQ* 28.1 (1956): 6–14; Norman Mundhenk, "Adoption: Being Recognized as Son," *BT* 59.4 (2008): 169–78; Nigel Watson, "And if Children, Then Heirs—Why Not Sons?," *ABR* 49 (2001): 53–56.

Brendan Byrne's *"Sons of God—Seed of Abraham,"*²⁷ James M. Scott's *Adoption as Sons of God*,²⁸ Robert Brian Lewis's *Paul's 'Spirit of Adoption' in Its Roman Imperial Context*,²⁹ Michael Peppard's *The Son of God in the Roman World*,³⁰ Caroline Johnson Hodge's *If Sons, Then Heirs*,³¹ and Trevor Burke's *Adopted into God's Family*.³² These studies can be roughly divided into two broad categories: investigations into the background of υιοθεσία, and hermeneutical approaches to the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline context.

Background Approaches

Prior to Byrne's seminal study in 1979, most Pauline scholars took for granted that the appropriate background for the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors was the Roman practice of adoption. The aim of Byrne's study was to demonstrate that the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are laden with the imagery of Jewish sonship, which Byrne argues is most appropriately read in light of background texts from the Old Testament and intertestamental literature.³³ Byrne asserts, "Paul works within the Jewish categories, employs Jewish terminology, has recourse to the Jewish basis of proof—Scripture. He may ask his Jewish and Judaistic Christian correspondents to turn their theology inside out; he does not require them to embrace a totally new conceptuality or learn a new language."³⁴ Byrne sets out to demonstrate his thesis by appealing to a wide and eclectic array of texts that he analyzes according to the categories: heavenly being (angelic) sonship, Israelite sonship, and royal sonship,³⁵ and central to his thesis is that the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία

27 Brendan Byrne, *"Sons of God—Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (AnBib 83, Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1979).

28 James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus* (WUNT 11 48, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992).

29 Robert Brian Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption" in Its Roman Imperial Context* (LNTS 545, London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

30 Michael Peppard, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

31 Caroline Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

32 Trevor Burke, *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor* (NSBT 22, Downers Grove: IVP, 2006).

33 Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1–8.

34 *Ibid.*, 220.

35 *Ibid.*, 9–69.

should be translated “sonship” rather than “adoption as son.”³⁶ Thus, Byrne’s methodological assumption that the Pauline metaphor is influenced by a particular religious background (Jewish sonship of God) rather than by its social context (Roman adoption) is fundamental to his argument.

In light of this survey of Jewish texts which, in his view, demonstrate Paul’s continuity with the Jewish notion of “sonship of God,” Byrne sees Romans 9:4 as the key to interpreting all of the Pauline occurrences. He argues, “Paul’s reference to υἱοθεσία in a formal list of the privileges of Israel in Rom 9:4 would seem to align him very closely to the ‘sonship of God’ tradition of the Jewish background.”³⁷ However, Byrne recognizes that while Paul is using a traditional category, he has a distinctly christological and eschatological interpretation of sonship that includes gentiles in the purview of the people of God.³⁸ Byrne concludes, “On every page of Galatians and Romans—not just in Rom 9–11—one senses the supreme anxiety to show that the unity of Jew and Gentile in Christ and the common sharing in the eschatological blessings was what was meant by God all along.”³⁹ This statement is indicative of Byrne’s proleptic reading of the Jewish sonship tradition in the Old Testament and intertestamental texts, and although his survey of the texts is thorough, Byrne’s approach to the Pauline texts does not address important methodological questions regarding how the υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians interact with this background material. Also typical of studies written before the advent of intertextual criticism in biblical studies, Byrne’s methodology gives no consideration to the nature of intertextual relationships based on the texts which he views as forming the background of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors.⁴⁰

Written largely in response to Byrne’s monograph, Scott’s book *Adoption as Sons of God* is an attempt to locate the meaning of the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors in a specific “Jewish adoption” text: 2 Samuel 7:14. Scott devotes considerable space in his erudite study to examining the lexical evidence for not only υἱοθεσία, but all of the members of the adoption word group (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν)⁴¹ in order to challenge Byrne’s claim that υἱοθεσία in the Pauline corpus should be translated “sonship” and understood against the broader background of the Jewish sonship tradition.⁴²

36 Ibid., 79–81.

37 Ibid., 84.

38 Ibid.

39 Ibid., 226.

40 Byrne’s methodological assumptions will be treated more extensively in chapter 2.

41 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 13.

42 Ibid., 55–57.

However, although Scott challenges the breadth of Byrne's notion of Jewish sonship, Scott argues that the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία are based on a specific Old Testament "Jewish adoption formula" which he sees in Jewish examples of both profane adoption (Gen 48:5–6; Exod 2:10; Esth 2:7, 15),⁴³ and divine adoption (2 Sam 7:14).⁴⁴ Scott then traces the reception of the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition through pre- and post-exilic Israel and concludes,

[T]he subsequent Jewish tradition based on 2 Sam 7:14 oriented the renewal of the covenant relationship, including Israel's divine sonship (cf. Hos 2:1), to the messianically-interpreted Davidic promise. . . . Hence the national expectation of divine adoption, converging as it does with the messianic expectation, leads to an appropriation of 2 Sam 7:14a to the eschatological people of God as a whole.⁴⁵

According to Scott, this national and messianic expectation of eschatological adoption, and the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, is the only acceptable background and starting point for the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία.⁴⁶ Perhaps the most influential contribution of Scott's thesis is his proposal of a new interpretive framework for Galatians 4:1–7 which he reads not as an example from a Greco-Roman household, but as an allusion to an exodus typology where verses 1–2 refer to Israel's enslavement in Egypt, and verses 3–7 refer to the "Second Exodus" where both Jews and gentiles are adopted as sons and brought "into relation with the messianic Son of God, just as in the 2 Sam 7:14 tradition."⁴⁷ Also in keeping with his emphasis on the importance of the adoption of the Davidide in 2 Samuel 7:14, Scott argues that Romans 1:3–4 indicates the adoption of Christ as the Davidide at the time of his resurrection.⁴⁸ According to Scott, Romans 8 indicates that "the sons who share in the messianic inheritance and reign with the Son (vv. 17b, 32b) are adopted on the basis of the same Davidic promise as the Son, because they participate in the sonship of the Son."⁴⁹ Scott further concludes that Romans 8 "contains both present and

43 Ibid., 74.

44 Ibid., 100.

45 Ibid., 117.

46 Ibid., 269.

47 Ibid., 145–86. Scott's proposed background of Galatians 4:1–7 will be treated extensively in chapter 5.

48 Ibid., 242–44.

49 Ibid., 255.

future aspects of υιοθεσία which are related as successive modes of participating in the sonship of the messianic Son of God by means of the Spirit.”⁵⁰

One significant oversight in Scott’s treatment of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors is his brief and cursory treatment of Romans 9:4.⁵¹ Apparently Scott assumes its relationship to his thesis regarding the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition to be self-evident, so in his brief treatment of Romans 9:4 Scott concludes, “υιοθεσία refers here [Rom 9:4] to the adoption as sons of God which, according to Hos 11:1 and Ex 4:22, Israel received at the Exodus.”⁵² Interestingly, although Scott criticizes Byrne for his translation “sonship,” Byrne’s translation in the Pauline corpus is largely influenced by texts such as Exodus 4:22 and Hosea 11:1, which he sees as the primary background for Romans 9:4. Scott indicates that he also sees these texts as the appropriate background for Romans 9:4, even though they lack the specific “Jewish adoption formula” that forms the crux of Scott’s argument.⁵³ It is difficult to ascertain precisely how Scott understands the place of Romans 9:4 within the overall schema of national and messianic adoption based on the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, and his explanation of the role and function of Romans 9:4 in the Pauline understanding of υιοθεσία is sorely lacking. Moreover, Scott’s thesis suffers from several fundamental methodological difficulties regarding the relationship between metaphor, background, and audience, as evidenced by his failure to consider the social context of Paul’s letters and their likely reception by his audiences in Rome and Galatia. Furthermore, Scott’s argument rests on a complicated and tortuous intertextual relationship between the Pauline texts and the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, but his monograph devotes no space to developing a sound methodology of intertextual inquiry and thus many of his conclusions are open to question on methodological grounds.⁵⁴

In his monograph, *The Son of God in the Roman World*, Michael Peppard devotes considerable attention to examining the practice and ideology of Roman adoption in its first-century context. The central premise of his book is that the metaphor of divine sonship has not been adequately considered in light of the Roman sociopolitical environment, and instead the exegesis of divine sonship texts has been unduly influenced by “elite theological debates of

50 Ibid., 265.

51 Scott only devotes an excursus of a short paragraph to Romans 9:4 (ibid., 148–49).

52 Ibid., 149.

53 Ibid.

54 Scott’s methodological assumptions regarding intertextuality will be treated in more detail in chapter 2.

later centuries.”⁵⁵ In order to root the biblical divine sonship metaphor in what Peppard deems to be its appropriate sociopolitical context, Peppard conducts a thorough investigation of the laws and practices of Roman adoption, with the aim of uncovering the Imperial ideology that lay behind these practices.⁵⁶ From his analysis Peppard concludes, “The imagery of the Roman household, and especially the ruling Imperial household, comprised a pervasive cultural ideology within which early Christian authors lived, thought and wrote. A key aspect of this family ideology was the upward mobility of adoption.”⁵⁷ Peppard continues, “[T]he more powerful a father is—even all-powerful, as a god—the more relevant adoption becomes to understand that father’s relationship to his son.”⁵⁸ Undoubtedly Peppard’s analysis of the sociopolitical context and ideology of Roman adoption is the most thorough and incisive discussion of this background material to date, and any further study of the υιοθεσία metaphors in the New Testament must engage with his discussion of these sources.

However, Peppard’s treatment of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors is quite brief and of secondary importance in the scope of his project, which is far more concerned with the reception of divine sonship in pre- and post-Nicene Christianity.⁵⁹ Approaching the background of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors from the perspective of Roman adoption, Peppard argues “the imagery is perfectly in line with our knowledge about adoption in Roman society,”⁶⁰ and Paul’s use of the metaphor “relies on a crucial feature of the social context—the *certainty* of an adopted son’s right to inherit from his adoptive father.”⁶¹ Peppard also asserts, “[T]he adoptive metaphor of Christian divine sonship is relatively easy to parse, especially using details of the Greco-Roman social context.”⁶² Peppard’s assessment of the prevalence and permeation of the Imperial household ideology in the first-century context of the New Testament make the Roman sociopolitical background an essential component to the exegesis of texts where divine sonship is in view, although more work is surely needed to apply Peppard’s insights to the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors. However, Peppard’s account of divine sonship must also be tempered with notions of divine sonship from the Jewish texts, which were arguably equally influential

55 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 3.

56 *Ibid.*, 50–85.

57 *Ibid.*, 175.

58 *Ibid.*, 85.

59 *Ibid.*, 135–40.

60 *Ibid.*, 135.

61 *Ibid.*, 136.

62 *Ibid.*, 137.

in Paul's writing and for early Christian communities.⁶³ Moreover, although Peppard touches on the need to situate a metaphor within its proper historical context, his monograph is not concerned with the finer points of how metaphors work with both their historical contexts and their literary contexts to produce meaning.

Peppard's monograph may mark a return to reading a predominantly Roman background for the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors. Taking his cue from Peppard's work, Robert Brian Lewis's study aims to flesh out the religious and political overtones of υιοθεσία in its Roman Imperial context, paying special attention to the connection between religious ideology and the perpetuation of Caesar's household.⁶⁴ Throughout his study, Lewis's primary concern is to show that "When Paul uses the phrase 'Spirit of adoption,' he is evoking an Imperial narrative, at once political and religious, to substantiate his claim that Gentile believers were to be counted as legitimate children of God in the same way as Jews."⁶⁵ To flesh out this Imperial narrative Lewis analyzes a large collection of Roman writings, inscriptions, coins, and other sources.⁶⁶ Drawing on these sources, Lewis sketches the Imperial ideology that was perpetuated through a series of strategic adoptions, beginning with Julius Caesar's testamentary adoption of Octavian, which Lewis calls "the most significant adoption in all of human history."⁶⁷ Succession by adoption continued as the primary means of Imperial succession throughout the first century, which leads Lewis to conclude that Paul "would have been familiar with the metaphor of adoption in the context of Imperial succession."⁶⁸ Earlier scholarly work has also pointed out the prominence of Imperial Roman adoption, but Lewis makes a unique contribution to research on the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors by connecting Roman adoption with Roman religious practice. He argues,

When someone was adopted, not only did family relationships change, but worship changed also. The adoptive family spirits became the spirits of the adoptee. The adoptee was expected to preserve the family cult and celebrate the worship of the *genius* of his new family. This was the

63 See Byrne, "Sons of God," 1–8; 213–26. Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 121–265.

64 Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption,"* 43–96.

65 *Ibid.*, 153.

66 See especially chapters 3–4 in Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption."*

67 *Ibid.*, 48.

68 *Ibid.*, 56.

expectation, not only in the Roman domestic cult, but certainly in the newly developing Imperial cult.⁶⁹

In his exegesis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 8:15, Lewis goes on to assert that adoption entails more than just a change of status, as has been previously thought.⁷⁰ Rather “a change in divinities had occurred,” and “The Spirit of Christ protected the believer not the *genius Augusti*.”⁷¹ Lewis’s research has important implications for analysis of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, as it now is clear that previous research that has focused solely on the legal practice of adoption has missed important and pervasive religious and political overtones. As Lewis rightly points out through the course of his study, the connection between adoption and Roman religious ideology must be incorporated into the discussion regarding the Roman background of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors.

However, because he is concerned to illuminate the background for the phrase ‘Spirit of adoption,’ Lewis’s own analysis of *υιοθεσία* is tightly focused on the metaphor in Romans 8:15. The *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8:23 and 9:4 receive minimal treatment,⁷² and he only briefly treats the metaphor in Galatians 4.⁷³ His brief treatment of the metaphor in Galatians is especially problematic for his thesis regarding the necessary connection between “Spirit” and “adoption,” since the phrase “Spirit of adoption (*πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας*)” does not appear in Galatians 4:5, which is parallel to Romans 8:15 in many other ways. Lewis calls Galatians 4:5 a “predecessor text,” but he does not give a clear argument as to why Paul “must” qualify “adoption” with “Spirit,” in Romans 8:15,⁷⁴ even though Paul does not use the phrase in his earlier text in Galatians. Presumably Lewis is implying that Paul has changed the phrase because of the Imperial context of Romans, but he does not say this explicitly. One explanation for the change in phrase from Galatians to Romans, which Lewis does not explore, is the possible negative associations that the Galatians may have had with Roman religion.⁷⁵ This possibility will be examined in the exegetical chapter on Galatians 4 in this study.

69 Ibid., 56.

70 Ibid., 183.

71 Ibid.

72 Ibid., 163–64, 181.

73 Ibid., 161.

74 Ibid., 153.

75 See Brigitte Kahl’s work, *Galatians Re-imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010).

Although Lewis rightly draws attention to several facets of Roman Imperial ideology and Roman religion that have been previously overlooked, Lewis's study fails to grapple with how metaphors work within texts to produce meaning. This is evident when he states, "To this point in the discussion adoption has been treated as a metaphor. The implication is that an adoption by God could not be envisioned as real."⁷⁶ Lewis goes on to defend the reality of adoption by arguing that

While there was no process whereby God actually came and adopted believers, baptism provided a concrete experience of God's presence in the liturgy. It seems likely that Paul conceived of the Spirit and the new reality that believers experienced as co-heirs with Christ in baptism as 'real,' and *not merely metaphorical*.⁷⁷

As I will show in two separate chapters on metaphor, this argument falls prey to the problematic post-Enlightenment notion that metaphors communicate truth of a lesser order than "literal" speech. Paul's υιοθεσία metaphors can be metaphorical and "real" at the same time.⁷⁸ Therefore, although Lewis's study lends valuable new insights into the connections between Roman Imperial ideology, Roman religion, and the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors, his work must be augmented by a more thorough and careful methodological treatment that attends to the metaphorical nature of the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline text.

Hermeneutical and Theological Approaches

Drawing upon insights from the ideology of patrilineal descent, Hodge in her monograph, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, proposes a unique hermeneutical solution for reading the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία as Paul's ritualized reconstruction of gentile origins.⁷⁹ Hodge is primarily concerned with mapping Paul's ethnic identities, and she argues, "For Paul, ethnic identity is inextricable from a people's standing before God: the gentiles are who they are because they have rejected the God of Israel."⁸⁰ A key tenet of Hodge's overall project is that kinship and ethnic identities are based both on natural and essential bonds

⁷⁶ Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption,"* 186.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 187. (emph. mine).

⁷⁸ See chapters 2 and 3 of this study.

⁷⁹ Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 67–78.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

(shared blood, lineage, etc.), and are also “open to change and rearrangement.”⁸¹ Following Stanley Stowers and relying on “a text-based interpretation” which, in Hodge’s assessment, indicates the letters were intended for an exclusively gentile audience, Hodge argues that the Pauline letters “are carefully constructed arguments addressed to gentile Christ-followers.”⁸² According to Hodge, one expressed purpose of Paul’s letters is to create gentile origins and construct gentile identity using the logic of patrilineal descent. She asserts that Paul accomplishes this construction of a new ethnic identity through rituals, such as baptism, and by redefining the line of patrilineal descent for gentile Christ-followers on the basis of the faithful actions of Abraham and Christ.⁸³ Based on her reading of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, Hodge concludes, “Romans 8:14–17 and Galatians 4:1–7 describe the same basic theory of kinship creation: Paul establishes a kinship for gentiles which is based not on shared blood, but on shared spirit.”⁸⁴

Unlike the monographs of Byrne, Scott, and Peppard, Hodge’s approach to the *υιοθεσία* metaphors consists primarily in her hermeneutical and rhetorical interests. However, from the outset of her monograph she assumes that *υιοθεσία* draws upon the ideology of adoption and kinship formation seen in Greek and Roman adoption practices. Although Hodge argues, “[A]doption was known among Jews,”⁸⁵ she cites examples from Philo and Josephus, so her concept of “Jewish adoption” is quite different from both Byrne and Scott who wish to locate Jewish adoption practices in specific Old Testament texts. Despite Hodge’s insistence that she does not rely on specific concepts of Greek, Roman, or Jewish adoption, but rather her premise rests on the assumption that “these cultures viewed adoption as a practical means of maintaining lineages,”⁸⁶ Hodge’s concept of adoption is clearly indebted to Greco-Roman practices where the purpose of adoption was to legitimate an heir in the patrilineal descent.⁸⁷ Also telling is Hodge’s brief treatment of how *υιοθεσία* is functioning in Romans 9:4 in respect to the *Ioudaioi*, perhaps because of the difficulty Paul’s use of *υιοθεσία* there creates for her overall thesis regarding the construction of gentile ethnic identities through adoption. Although Hodge argues, “Israelite identity is rooted in the stories of their ancestors, the

81 Ibid., 21.

82 Ibid., 10–11.

83 Ibid., 79–91.

84 Ibid., 77.

85 Ibid., 31.

86 Ibid.

87 Hodge cites no example of a Jewish adoption where this kind of legitimation occurs.

covenants, and the promises which established them as adopted sons of God,” she does not adequately address how the Israelite adoption in Romans 9:4 may differ from the adoption of gentiles in Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8:15–23. Rather, she asserts that the adoption of these two groups maintains the ethnic distinctions between the gentiles and the *Ioudaioi*, and that these distinctions continue even “in Christ,”⁸⁸ though it is unclear how salient Hodge thinks these ethnic distinctions are in light of the Christ-event. However, Hodge’s query regarding the function of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the construction of identity for Paul’s audience is an important area of research, and one that would surely benefit from interacting with research from other disciplines regarding the role of metaphor in group identity construction.⁸⁹

Published in 2006, Burke’s monograph aims to synthesize key exegetical insights from the Pauline adoption passages in order to delineate a comprehensive Pauline theology of adoption. Burke sees *υιοθεσία* as an “organizing metaphor”⁹⁰ for salvation because it, “(1) centres in the person and work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; (2) it shares a moral focus evident in other soteriological expressions in Paul’s writings; and (3) it is eschatological in nature.”⁹¹ Although Burke argues that *υιοθεσία* was a term Paul borrowed from the “Roman sociolegal context of his day,” Burke also asserts that “we cannot separate the Jewish or Graeco-Roman cultural influences that impacted the apostle Paul,” and thus the issue of the metaphor’s Jewish or Greco-Roman background, in Burke’s view, is a false dichotomy.⁹² Drawing primarily on the Greco-Roman “sociolegal” understanding of adoption, Burke’s study then outlines what he sees as “the trinitarian implications”⁹³ of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors, including the role of God as *ʾabbā* Father,⁹⁴ the Christocentric importance of the Son,⁹⁵ and the personal and familial role of the Spirit in the believer’s adoption.⁹⁶ From his analysis of these theological aspects of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the Pauline corpus (Gal 4:5; Rom 8:15–23; Rom 9:4, Eph 1:5) Burke concludes, “*Huiiothesia* is not only a theological but also a soteriological metaphor that underscores the

88 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 48.

89 This question will be taken up in chapter 3.

90 By “organizing” Burke means that the metaphor combines soteriological, moral, and eschatological elements into the single expression of adoption (*Adopted into God’s Family*, 41).

91 Ibid.

92 Ibid., 194.

93 Ibid., 31.

94 Ibid., 72–99.

95 Ibid., 100–124.

96 Ibid., 125–51.

subjective side of the believer's salvation,"⁹⁷ which draws its meaning from its setting in the ancient household and *familia*.⁹⁸

At the outset of his monograph, Burke briefly discusses ancient and current understandings of metaphor, and concludes, "[T]he family in the ancient world, or more specifically the father-to-the-adopted-son relation, serves as the *source* domain or *donor* field, whereas the Christian's relationship to God is the *target* domain or the *recipient* field."⁹⁹ Burke presumably uses this schema of the source and target domain to analyze all of the occurrences of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the Pauline corpus, though he never specifically refers to it again. Rather, Burke proceeds with the tacit assumption that these source and target domains underlie each occurrence of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, which I will show to be a problematic methodological assumption based on a more nuanced understanding of contemporary theories of metaphor. As I will demonstrate in the next two chapters of this study, current theories of metaphor are diverse and nuanced, and analyzing a text using contemporary metaphor theory requires careful attention to questions of how metaphors work to create meaning for their hearers or readers.

The monographs devoted to explicating the background of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors have contributed significantly to their understanding by mapping out various influences which may have contributed to a metaphor's meaning for Paul's audience members. Likewise, Burke and Hodge's monographs have raised interesting exegetical and hermeneutical questions regarding the significance of these metaphors within their settings in the Pauline corpus. However, no study has been undertaken which seriously treats the question of how to read and analyze the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors as metaphors. In order to understand the meaning of these metaphors, they must be analyzed using a comprehensive and rigorous theory of metaphor that includes a nuanced understanding of how metaphorical meaning is produced, and what effects metaphors have on their audience. This is the task that will be undertaken in the remainder of this study.

The Scope of This Project

The two chief purposes of this study are (1) to develop and defend a multifaceted hermeneutical approach to reading metaphors in the biblical text, and

97 Ibid., 194.

98 Ibid.

99 Ibid., 34.

(2) to utilize this methodology to glean new exegetical insights from a fresh reading of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors. The methodology I put forth is intentionally eclectic, drawing on philosophical approaches to metaphor and language and on insights from cognitive linguistics, communication studies, and anthropology. Rarely have these disciplines been merged within a single methodology, but I maintain that these areas complement each other and each bring distinct benefits to the hermeneutical process. Since the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors are embedded in texts, the emphasis on textuality found in many philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor allows for a rigorous hermeneutic that identifies specific features of the texts in which the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors occur. These features include a delineation of the metaphorical utterance and its frame, the identification of the metaphor's tenor and vehicle, and the likely level of emphasis and resonance based on its presentation in the text.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, hermeneutical advances in intertextuality will be combined with philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor in order to carefully consider how metaphors function in intertextual relationships. Because in Romans 9:4 the *υιοθεσία* metaphor is predicated of the Israelites, this question regarding intertextuality is of preeminent importance for understanding its impact, yet interpreters thus far have overlooked its significance in their exegesis. The precision of the delineations achievable through philosophical and literary approaches to metaphor allow the interpreter to pinpoint and map the components of the various Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, thereby drawing attention to the similarities and differences which exist in their setting, structure, and implications.

Moreover, the groundwork laid by a methodologically rigorous approach to a metaphor's textual features provides an avenue for further inquiry regarding its impact on extra-textual features such as perception, emotion, and group identity formation. Since the Pauline texts were written to specific audiences, it is not enough to attend to the textual features of the metaphors; one must also consider the reception of these metaphors by the Pauline audiences. To be sure, one of the chief difficulties in assessing the impact of the extra-textual elements of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors is the lack of access to the original audience of the text. However, studies in cognitive linguistics and communication have demonstrated that metaphors possess a powerful capacity to influence the perceptions and attitudes of their intended audiences, and thus can be highly effective tools for shaping group identity. Therefore, a comprehensive hermeneutical approach to the *υιοθεσία* metaphors must incorporate these insights in order to address questions regarding the impact of the various *υιοθεσία* metaphors on their audiences.

100 These terms will be discussed in detail in chapter 2.

It also is beneficial at the outset to delineate several topics this study does not address. First, this study is not an attempt to rule out various “backgrounds” of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors. Several monographs have already been devoted to identifying and describing the various possible backgrounds of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, and it is not within the purview of this study to build significantly upon this work.¹⁰¹ Moreover, as I will show through arguments regarding the relationship between metaphor and model, attempting to eliminate any of the proposed backgrounds of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors emerges from a misguided understanding of the relationship between metaphors and their underlying models, and the result is unnecessarily reductive. Rather, I argue that a plurality of models is appropriate for the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors because it is likely that individual members of Paul’s audience would have been familiar with one or all of them. However, I will evaluate the likelihood of each *υιοθεσία* metaphor evoking each of the three proposed models based on the surrounding literary context and on considerations regarding the makeup of Paul’s audience, and show that certain *υιοθεσία* metaphors are more likely to evoke a Greek or Roman model of adoption, and at least one *υιοθεσία* metaphor (Rom 9:4) likely draws the model of Jewish sonship firmly into view.

Furthermore, this study does not attempt to propose a univocal meaning for “the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphor,” but rather shows that the four Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors function much like the bands of color which occur when white light is passed through a prism. Their meanings exist as part of the same spectrum, but they remain discrete parts of the composite whole. As I show in the discussion on methodology, the meaning of metaphors occurs at the level of a complete utterance rather than with an individual word or lexeme. Moreover, changes to the frame of a metaphor result in differences in metaphorical meaning. I have already spoken of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, rather than the singular Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphor; this distinction is intentional. This study treats each of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors as a separate utterance capable of producing variations in meaning, and holds these meanings in tension rather than attempting to synthesize them into a single “meaning” for *υιοθεσία* in the Pauline text. However, this is not to say that the synthesis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors into more comprehensive theological categories such as their soteriological implications, eschatological implications, ecclesiological implications, or anthropological implications is impossible or even undesirable. Rather, what this study’s proposed methodology shows is that this synthesis is a step beyond the exegesis of the individual metaphors, and must

101 The three proposed backgrounds will each be discussed and evaluated as a potential underlying model for the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in chapter 4.

be derived from first considering their meanings as discrete utterances. Such a synthetic endeavor, unfortunately, falls outside the purview of this study, but it is certainly a viable avenue for further research.

Although several monographs on the υιοθεσία metaphors have argued that the Pauline uses of υιοθεσία must be read in light of the adoption of Christ as the Son,¹⁰² this study does not attempt to investigate the purported adoption of Christ in relation to the Pauline uses of υιοθεσία for several reasons. First, and most significantly, Paul does not use the vocabulary of υιοθεσία or any term from the same semantic domain to metaphorically describe Christ's sonship anywhere in Romans or Galatians, and most certainly not in the passages (or frames) where the υιοθεσία metaphors occur. Instead, Paul reserves the term πρωτότοκος (firstborn) for Christ in Romans 8:29, and in Galatians 4:4 he simply refers to Christ as "the Son" (υιός). Although Peppard is correct in stating that πρωτότοκος (firstborn) "does not necessarily designate begotten sonship,"¹⁰³ neither does the term explicitly connote adoptive sonship. Peppard is correct in his assessment that "firstborn" denotes the place and privilege of a son rather than primogeniture,¹⁰⁴ but Peppard's further claim that Paul's audience would have undoubtedly seen their own adoption as wrapped up in the *adoption* of the Son is not warranted by the context of the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 nor in Galatians 4.¹⁰⁵ Nor is Scott's claim convincing when he argues that Romans 1:4a "is a circumlocution for the Adoption Formula in 2 Sam 7:14a," since there are significant differences in vocabulary between these two passages. Moreover, Paul's designation of Christ as τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει (the one who was appointed the Son of God in power) in Romans 1:4a does not contain significant overlaps with the vocabulary Paul uses to metaphorically describe the sonship of believers in Romans 8 (most notably ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας/you have received the Spirit of adoption). This is further confirmed by the lack of a specific designation of Christ as the adopted son in close proximity to the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15, and in Paul's preference for other terms of sonship in regard to Christ in Romans 8:15–39 (e.g., πρωτότοκος (firstborn), and τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ (his own son)). Furthermore, there is no indication that Paul views Christ's sonship as specifically adoptive sonship in Galatians, nevertheless Paul utilizes a υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 to metaphorically describe the sonship of the Galatian believers. If Paul wished to stress the importance of the link between Christ's sonship and the sonship of believers

102 See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 223–43; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 137–40.

103 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 139.

104 Ibid.

105 See *ibid.*, 139–40.

as both being sonship by *adoption* in particular, it is peculiar that he did not connect them more specifically in the context of any of his υἱοθεσία metaphors. Therefore, because the adoption of believers is not explicitly linked with the adoption of Christ in any of the passages where υἱοθεσία metaphors occur, this study does not address the issue of Christ's adoption in connection with the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors.

The final preliminary issue that must be addressed before this study can proceed is the difficulty of gender-inclusivity, metaphor, and translation. Many scholars have noted that υἱοθεσία unequivocally refers to the adoption of males, and many argue that the most faithful translation is therefore "adoption as sons."¹⁰⁶ This translation is further supported by a wealth of inscriptional evidence that preserves θυγατροθεσία (adoption as daughter) as the preferred designation for the adoption of daughters,¹⁰⁷ with τεκνοθεσία (adoption as child) also occasionally used to describe the adoption of women.¹⁰⁸ Given the gender-specificity of υἱοθεσία, it is unlikely that Paul's original audience would have understood the meaning of the word to be anything other than "adoption as sons." In an effort to preserve the link between the Pauline metaphor and its underlying models of adoption and sonship, I will proceed with the assumption that the term is gender-specific and use the translation "adoption as sons."¹⁰⁹

However, as I show in the methodological portion of this study, the gender-specific meaning of υἱοθεσία does not necessarily lead to a gender-exclusive metaphor. Paul uses gender-specific language of himself when he invokes the imagery of a nursing mother to metaphorically describe his behavior to the Thessalonians (1 Thess 2:7) and the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:1–3a), and this surely does not imply in any way that Paul thought of himself as anatomically or ontologically female. Moreover, Corley points out that the masculine κληρονόμος (heir) was used of both men and women, despite the term being unambiguously masculine in gender.¹¹⁰ In the context of both Romans and Galatians it is clear that Paul does not intend υἱοθεσία to exclude the female members of his audiences (e.g., Gal 3:28), and it is also clear that he is using υἱοθεσία

106 See e.g., Corley's extended treatment of the issue in "Women's Inheritance Rights," 98–121; also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv; Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 21 n. 2.

107 See e.g., Andreas Victor Walser, "ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΘΕΣΙΑ—Ein Neues Zeignis aus Kaunos für die Adoption von Frauen," *EA* 37 (2004): 101–106.

108 Corley, "Women's Inheritance Rights," 99.

109 In Romans 8:14–17 Paul blends the vocabulary of adoption (υἱοθεσία and υἱός/son) with the gender-neutral τέκνα/children (8:16–17). There I will refer to "sonship/childship" in order to recognize Paul's more gender-inclusive vocabulary.

110 *Ibid.*, 117–19.

metaphorically, which makes its application akin to Paul's use of female imagery to metaphorically describe his ministry to the churches in Thessalonica and Corinth. However, it must also be said that although υιοθεσία is being used metaphorically and therefore does not exclude the women in Paul's audience from participating in adoption, Corley's assertion that a woman "must have maleness conferred on her before she can be made a son" is also apt.¹¹¹ There is undoubtedly room for critique of the patriarchal values that underlie Paul's imagery in his υιοθεσία metaphors, which denied women equal access to inheritance and the ability to adopt heirs themselves. However, in order to best situate the υιοθεσία metaphors within their first-century context and to best understand their impact on Paul's audiences, they must be viewed in light of the patriarchal system from which they are drawn—even though it means that a woman in Paul's audience, as Corley points out, "must take an additional step up the hierarchical ladder" in order to experience the metaphor in its fullness.¹¹²

Overview of Chapters

This study is divided into two major sections, placing an equal emphasis on methodology and exegesis. The first section of this study (chapters 2–4) addresses three complementary areas of methodological inquiry, and the second section (chapters 5–7) presents an exegetical analysis of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors using the categories outlined in section 1.

In the first part of the study, chapter 2 examines the question, "What are metaphors?" using insights primarily from philosophical studies on the nature of metaphorical language. After examining several competing contemporary theories of metaphor, this chapter defends the merits of Soskice's definition of a metaphor as particularly well suited to the study of the biblical text. This chapter also identifies and outlines several key components of metaphor that are important for exegetical inquiry: frame, model, tenor, vehicle, emphasis, and resonance. Complementing the material in the second chapter, chapter 3 examines the question, "What do metaphors do?" using insights from cognitive linguistics, anthropology, and research in rhetoric and communication. Drawing upon current research from these diverse fields, this chapter argues that metaphors have the capacity to profoundly influence the perceptions and emotions of their audience members, creating bonds between audience mem-

¹¹¹ Ibid., 121.

¹¹² Ibid.

bers and boundaries around group identity. Completing the first section of the study, chapter 4 is devoted to an examination of three proposed models which underlie the υιοθεσία metaphors: Jewish sonship, Greek adoption practices, and Roman adoption practices, since these three models were likely the most familiar to Paul's audience.

In the second part of the study, chapter 5 utilizes the methodology developed in the previous chapters to exegete a υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5. Here I argue that Paul utilizes the υιοθεσία metaphor to shape the audience's perception of God's mission (Father, Son, and Spirit) to be viewed in terms of sonship and inheritance, and that Paul appeals to the Galatians' experience of the Spirit as the foundation for the cognitive framework created by the metaphor. Chapter 6 examines the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15–23, arguing that these metaphors form a diptych that highlights the eschatological tension between the present age and the age to come. By drawing attention to their temporal displacement, the two υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 solidify the bonds between Paul's audience members formed around their shared experience of existential tension and suffering. Chapter 7 considers the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, paying particular attention to the relationship between the Pauline metaphor and the intertextual relationships evoked through the underlying models. Rather than drawing upon a traditional designation for Israel, I argue that Paul's use of υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 reframes and reinterprets key elements of Israel's history and Scripture through the framework of adoption. This reframing creates a shared vision of Israel among Paul's Jewish and gentile audience members, for whom, through the use of a υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, Paul cultivates an empathic concern for the Israelites as God's chosen people among his Christ-following audience. The final chapter attempts a cautious synthesis of the υιοθεσία metaphors, taking care to preserve the spectrum of meanings located in each υιοθεσία metaphor in the Pauline text. The synthesis aims at coherence rather than harmonization, and highlights the commonalities between each metaphor. Finally, in light of the methodology proposed in the first part of this study, the final chapter offers four significant challenges, drawn from the hermeneutics of metaphor, for the way that Pauline theology is conducted.

A Working Theory of Metaphor

Introduction

Although there have been numerous studies published on the background and interpretation of Pauline metaphors, thus far most Pauline scholars have been chary of venturing into the landscape of contemporary metaphor theories to aid in the exegetical process. To be sure, the sheer quantity of literature that has been produced by various disciplines regarding the nature and function of metaphor seems daunting, but this research provides biblical scholars with important tools for exegesis and interpretation. Moreover, even the label “contemporary metaphor theory” is a misnomer, as there are many areas of current research that have developed their own theories of what metaphors are and how they function. Areas such as cognitive linguistics, philosophy of language, communication, and anthropology do not necessarily draw upon the work of other fields, but all of these fields have produced research on metaphor that is relevant to the study of metaphors in the biblical text. For biblical studies the two most influential bodies of literature on metaphor come from philosophical approaches to metaphor and cognitive studies on metaphor. However, these two areas of metaphor research are not often integrated into an approach to the exegesis of biblical metaphors. One primary aim of this study is to combine insights from philosophical approaches to metaphor that focus primarily on what metaphors “are” with insights from cognitive linguistics that focus primarily on what metaphors “do,” and also on “how they do it,” as both of these modes of inquiry are useful for the exegesis of the biblical text.¹ As I will show below, these areas of inquiry cannot be neatly separated, since philosophical accounts of what metaphors “are” rest upon assumptions of how language users derive meaning from linguistic utterances, which impinges upon important research in cognitive linguistics. In light of the overlap between philosophy of language and cognitive linguistics, in the present chapter I will briefly survey new research that demonstrates meaning as mental simulation/embodiment, and then proceed to an explanation of how this research adds both depth and

1 There is an ever-growing trend in philosophy to integrate research from cognitive linguistics into philosophical arguments regarding epistemology and ontology. See Mark Johnson, “Philosophy’s Debt to Metaphor,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 39–52.

concreteness to the theoretical work on metaphor undertaken by philosophers of language. Then, in the next chapter I will draw further on the insights from cognitive linguistics to elucidate the capacity of textual metaphors to shape and influence the perceptions, emotions, and identity-formation of individuals and groups.

Philosophers of language approach metaphors as a feature of language use and tend to focus their discussion and field of inquiry tightly around metaphor and text. This tight focus on metaphor as a *phenomenon of language use* is particularly helpful in treating biblical metaphors, which are, of course, features of biblical texts. However, this immediately raises questions about the role of the author and audience in the reading of the text, and even more fundamentally, of what constitutes a text.² At times, biblical interpreters have assumed that reading metaphors is a straightforward, simplistic process,³ but even a cursory reading of the debate surrounding metaphor theory among philosophers of language shows that the interpretation of a metaphor is anything but straightforward. Moreover, recent work in cognitive linguistics regarding how the brain processes language can now provide a scientific foundation for the philosophical treatment of metaphor found in the older, foundational studies that I will examine below.

The abundance of research on metaphor in other fields demonstrates that if biblical scholars are to appreciate the complexities of biblical metaphors, then their exegesis must also be founded upon a theory of metaphor that is scientifically and philosophically sound and also exegetically useful. The aims of this chapter are twofold: (1) to briefly survey the most viable options for a theory of metaphor that is workable and useful for biblical exegesis and (2) to

2 The term “text” is especially debated in regard to intertextual inquiry and methodologies, and this issue will be discussed in more detail below; see also Hennig Tegtmeier, “Der Begriff der Intertextualität und seine Fassungen: Eine Kritik der Intertextualitätskonzepte Julia Kristevas und Susanne Holthuis,” in *Textbeziehungen: linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität*, ed. Josef Klein (Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997), 49; Susanne Holthuis, *Intertextualität: Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption* (Stauffenburg Colloquium 28, Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1993), 1–28, 51–53.

3 For example, the debate surrounding the meaning of κεφαλή in Ephesians 5:23 is often framed as either denoting “source” or “authority.” Both sides of the debate assume that the metaphorical use of a word in various contexts can be reduced to a single meaning; e.g., Catherine Clark Kroeger, “The Classical Concept of ‘Head’ as ‘Source,’” in *Equal to Serve*, ed. Gretchen Gaebelein Hull (London: Scripture Union, 1987), 267–83; Wayne Grudem, “Does κεφαλή (‘Head’) Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’ in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples,” *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59; idem, “The Meaning of κεφαλή (‘Head’): A Response to Recent Studies,” *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3–72.

address several preliminary issues that arise from drawing on metaphor theory for the exegetical process. In the first section of the chapter, I will first give a brief overview of insights from cognitive linguistics on how our minds create meaning from linguistic utterances. In the next section I will define relevant linguistic and philosophical terms and will focus specifically on the theories put forth by Black and Soslke, supplementing their research with more recent insights into how our minds make meaning from textual metaphors. The second section will address practical issues that arise as a result of combining metaphor theory with biblical exegesis, such as: (1) the connections between metaphor, context, and intertextuality (2) the indeterminacy of metaphorical meaning, and (3) the connection between metaphor and reference.

Meaning and Embodied Simulation

When Victor Hugo wrote, “A man is not idle, because he is absorbed in thought. There is a visible labour and there is an invisible labour. To meditate is to labour; to think is to act,”⁴ he undoubtedly was unaware of how profound a statement this is in light of recent research in cognitive linguistics.⁵ A host of empirical studies have shown that one of the primary ways our minds make meaning out of linguistic utterances is through *embodied simulation*.⁶ Put simply, *embodied simulation* postulates that that people make meaning of language by simulating in their minds what the language describes.⁷ To illustrate, let us take an example from one of my favorite childhood books: *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.⁸ Anyone who has read the book knows that the Wicked Witch of the West has a horde of Winged Monkeys at her disposal, and she calls upon them to aid her in her plot to avenge her sister’s death. However, we also can agree that there is no such thing as a Winged Monkey. Yet, it is likely that despite the fact that

4 Victor Hugo, *Les Misérables*, trans. Charles E. Wilbour (New York: Knopf, 1998), 517.

5 There is not space here to engage in arguments regarding older theories of meaning, but advances in cognitive linguistics show that embodied simulation is an integral component to how the mind makes meaning of linguistic utterances. See especially Benjamin K. Bergen, *Louder than Words: The New Science of How the Mind Makes Meaning* (New York: Basic Books, 2012), 6–9; 223–246.

6 Ibid., 13–22.

7 See L. W. Barsalou, “Perceptual Symbol Systems,” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22 (1999): 577–609; V. Gallese, L. Fadiga, L. Fogassi, G. Rizzolatti, “Action Recognition in the Premotor Cortex,” *Brain* 119 (1996): 593–609; see also Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 13–22 for a summary of this research.

8 L. Frank Baum, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (Chicago: George M. Hill Company, 1900).

Winged Monkeys are fictitious, most people, even those who have not read Baum's description of a Winged Monkey, would have no difficulty in answering the question, "How many wings does a Winged Monkey have?" To be sure, it is not at all clear, even for those familiar with Baum's fictitious Winged Monkeys, why a monkey must have wings in order to fly, or why a Winged Monkey is able to fly at all (why isn't it more like a flightless bird?), and yet it seems that the most common answer to this question is "2 wings."

The interesting question to consider is the process by which our brains make meaning of a sentence that picks out a fictitious referent like a Winged Monkey. What cognitive linguists have shown is that even for fictitious scenarios, our brains engage their visual systems in order to simulate the object: "Winged Monkey," which means that we "see" a Winged Monkey when we are asked how many wings a Winged Monkey has.⁹ Likewise our brains engage our auditory systems to simulate what Winged Monkeys sound like,¹⁰ and they engage our motor systems to simulate how Winged Monkeys move.¹¹ Thus despite having never seen a Winged Monkey, your brain can construct and simulate not only the object Winged Monkey but the experience of hearing the screech of a Winged Monkey (or do they growl?), and seeing a Winged Monkey descending upon Dorothy as it fulfills its commission to the Wicked Witch of the West. As it turns out, cognitive linguistics has shown that as far as your brain is concerned, reading about a Winged Monkey in a book may not be all that different than encountering one in the magical Land of Oz.¹²

Moreover, your brain not only performs mental simulations as a component of making meaning from linguistic utterances, but the grammatical construction and verbal aspect of a linguistic utterance actually influences the perspective you take in your mental simulations.¹³ What cognitive linguists have found is that when first and second person language is used, hearers are more likely

9 See Bergen, *Louder than Words* for further illustrations (including a similar illustration about flying pigs) about how simulation works to create meaning.

10 Ibid., 46–47; see also D. Pecher, R. Zeelenberg, and L. W. Barsalou "Verifying Different Modality Properties for Concepts Produces Switching Costs," *Psychological Science* 14 (2003): 119–124.

11 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 73–75; see also Benjamin Bergen and Kathryn Wheeler, "Sentence Understanding Engages Motor Processes," in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 2005.

12 Unless, of course, L. Frank Baum has led us all astray and Winged Monkeys do not actually resemble the creatures he describes in his book, in which case your mental simulation would vary considerably from the "real thing."

13 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 93–119; see also G. Nigro and U. Neisser, "Point of View in Personal Memories," *Cognitive Psychology* 15 (1983): 467–82.

to adopt a participant perspective in their simulations of the sentences.¹⁴ Thus if you read the sentence “I shall command the Winged Monkeys to carry you to the gates of the Emerald City,”¹⁵ you would be more likely to adopt the perspective of a participant being carried off by a Winged Monkey (presumably to meet the Wizard). Likewise if you read the sentence, “Some of the Monkeys seized the Tin Woodman and carried him through the air,”¹⁶ you would be more likely to simulate the poor Tin Woodman’s unwanted aerial journey from the perspective of an observer.¹⁷ What is perhaps even more interesting is that the verbal aspect of each sentence also influences whether a reader adopts the perspective of an observer or a participant. In the first sentence, the progressive aspect of “I shall command” makes your brain simulate the ongoing action of being carried, whereas if we changed the sentence to “I commanded the Winged Monkeys to carry you,” your brain would be more likely to simulate the completed state of “having been carried” by Winged Monkeys.¹⁸

There is much more here that could be said about meaning and embodied simulation of language,¹⁹ but for the sake of this study I will limit my treatment here to several important implications for the exegesis of biblical metaphor. First, the embodied simulation theory seems to suggest that, at least in the case of lively metaphors,²⁰ our brains actively produce simulations that are derived from, and constrained by, linguistic utterances. So if I said, “My children, those Winged Monkeys of destruction, descended on their toy box in a frenzy,” your brain would likely simulate a detailed picture of the scene “Winged Monkeys descending on a toy box” and not a more generic version like “children behaving wildly.” Moreover, what exactly a brain simulates in regard to these Winged Monkeys is contingent upon the culture, experience, knowledge, and expertise of a hearer or reader. For example, is the Winged Monkey in the sentence an exact representation of the film’s flying monkeys? Is it instead derived from the illustrations in Baum’s book? Or perhaps a Winged Monkey is an entirely foreign idea because some people have never read or seen *The Wonderful Wizard*

14 See Bergen, *Louder Than Words*, 93–119.

15 Baum, *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*.

16 Ibid.

17 Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 110–114; see also R. A. Zwaan, “The Immersed Experiencer: Toward an Embodied Theory of Language Comprehension,” in *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, vol. 43, ed. B. H. Ross (New York: Academic Press, 2004), 35–62.

18 Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 115–118.

19 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 223–260 for a detailed discussion of the state of the question regarding meaning and embodied simulation and further directions in research that cognitive linguists are actively pursuing.

20 More will be said about novel metaphors below.

of Oz. The resulting simulations are contingent, then, on the experiences of the audience members who are engaged in the communicative act,²¹ and thus an examination of a biblical metaphor must take into account the contexts of both the metaphor-maker and also the audience to grasp how a biblical metaphor would have been understood. Second, the embodied simulation theory seems to undercut the notion that our brains work harder to process metaphor than they do to process “literal language,” especially language containing abstract concepts. Instead, cognitive linguistics shows that embodied simulation is a normal, functional component of how our brains make meaning of concrete sentences, and of lively metaphorical sentences that utilize concrete terms for abstract concepts.²² Therefore, the task of analyzing a biblical metaphor cannot be an attempt to find a suitable literal paraphrase for what the metaphor “means,” since “meaning” is wrapped up in the mental simulation that accompanies the original metaphor. Third, the study of metaphor must pay close attention to the grammatical construction and verbal aspect of metaphorical utterances to better predict what perspective a reader or hearer is likely to take when he or she is hearing the metaphor, and further, as I will discuss in more detail in the next chapter, to postulate how this perspective-taking might contribute to the construction of personal and group identity. This is an area of ongoing research, and breakthroughs in cognitive linguistics regarding the role that embodied simulation plays in the creation of meaning may extend an even greater range of applications for embodied simulation in the analysis of biblical texts in the future.

Metaphor: A Working Definition

In any area of research regarding metaphor, agreeing upon a definition for “metaphor” is a notoriously difficult problem. However, the difficulty in defining precisely what a metaphor is does not necessary equate to difficulty in identifying a metaphor. Booth remarks that he and his students “have so far not found any one definition of metaphor that we all could possibly agree on.

21 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 151–174; see also L. E. Holt and S. L. Beilock, “Expertise and Its Embodiment: Examining the Impact of Sensorimotor Skill Expertise on the Representation of Action-Related Text,” *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 13 (2006): 694–701; S. I. Wassenburg, and R. A. Zwaan, “Readers Routinely Represent Implied Object Rotation: The Role of Visual Experience,” *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 63 (2010): 1665–1670.

22 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 195–222.

But we have found innumerable instances of what all of us happily call metaphors regardless of our definition.”²³ Given the complexity of the debate, it is beyond the purview of this study to posit yet another definition for metaphor or to give an exhaustive list of criteria for their identification.²⁴ Rather, my purpose here is to evaluate and apply the advances in metaphor theory put forth by philosophers of language²⁵ to the task of biblical exegesis of the Pauline *υἱοθεσία* metaphors. What is needed for the task at hand, then, is a *working definition* of metaphor chosen for the explanatory power it brings to the process of exegesis, and as such this study relies upon Soskice’s carefully reasoned definition of a metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”²⁶ The following section begins by providing a brief overview and critique of several competing theories of metaphor, and then proceeds with a defense of Soskice’s definition and its usefulness for biblical exegesis. Since my focus is exegetical rather than philosophical, I do not mean to offer here a comprehensive case for the merits of Soskice’s definition; such an endeavor is well outside of the purview of this study. Rather, what follows is an introductory explanation of contemporary metaphor theories in philosophy of language that gives due credence to the philosophical debate, but also functions as the point of departure for the more practical task of biblical interpretation in the second part of this study.

Substitution or Comparison Theories

Any discussion of the origins of a formal account of metaphor usually begins with Aristotle, who in his *Poetics* says, “Metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else; the transference being either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy” (*Poetics* 1457b 6–9). At first blush, Aristotle’s definition seems both useful and straightforward, however upon further examination it is doubtful that current philosophers of language would classify some of Aristotle’s

23 Booth, “Metaphor as Rhetoric,” 49.

24 Several good examples of definitions and criteria for identification include: Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15–23; John R. Searle, “Metaphor,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 83–108; Peter Macky, *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990), 31–56.

25 This is not to imply that the advances in cognitive linguistics or other fields are less important. However, those fields are typically not as interested in defending a particular definition of metaphor as they are examining how metaphors work in our cognitive processes. This research will be examined in the next chapter.

26 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

examples as metaphors at all.²⁷ Furthermore, it is important to note that Aristotle's explanation of metaphor tends to confine it to an attribute of an individual word, rather than a phrase or a sentence.²⁸ As we shall see, such a limitation has vast implications for any theory of metaphor, and especially for the application of such a theory to the interpretation of biblical texts, where the surrounding context must be recognized as equally important to a metaphor's interpretation.

Next to Aristotle's, Quintilian's writings on metaphor have enjoyed the most influence on contemporary theories of metaphor. Though his theory is perhaps more oriented towards praxis and is typically considered less developed than Aristotle's, Quintilian nevertheless made a significant contribution to the understanding of metaphor in his *Institutio Oratoria*. Certainly his oft-quoted adage, "*In totum autem metaphora brevior est similitudo*,"²⁹ has contributed a great deal to later comparison theories of metaphor. However, Quintilian's aim was to explain the connection between metaphor and rhetoric, not to develop a sophisticated linguistic or philosophical account of metaphor, and neither Aristotle's nor Quintilian's definitions should be judged according to the criteria of later theories.

Though neither Aristotle nor Quintilian set out to write a purely philosophical defense of the nature of metaphor, their writing has given rise to contemporary comparison theories,³⁰ which assert that there is a suitable literal paraphrase in the form of a comparison for every metaphorical utterance. Thus, "Juliet is the sun," has as its paraphrase "Juliet is like the sun," and so forth. To be sure, the ease of identifying the underlying simile in a metaphorical utterance varies from metaphor to metaphor. For example, it is much more difficult to find a literal paraphrase for Picasso's "Art washes from the soul the dust of everyday life." Perhaps we could say something like "Art removes the trivial things of everyday life like water removes dust from a surface"? As seen in these paraphrases, the trouble with comparison theories is that everything turns out to be "like" everything in ways that are often vapid

27 Soksice observes, "The first two of Aristotle's types of transfer . . . pick out what is customarily regarded as the separate trope of synecdoche" (ibid., 5); see also Paul Ricoeur, "for Aristotle the word *metaphor* applies to every transposition of terms" (*The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny, [London: Routledge, 1978], 17).

28 Soksice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 5.

29 "On the whole, metaphor is a shorter form of simile," Quintilian, *Inst.* VIII.vi.8.

30 Black, "More About Metaphor," 35.

and trivial.³¹ Furthermore, metaphor theorists have long observed that treating literal utterances as an unproblematic standard and metaphorical utterances as mysterious deviations from conventional language encourages and perpetuates reductionist theories,³² and moreover, recent research has shown that our brains process metaphors in much the same way as they process concrete utterances.³³ Furthermore, the literal paraphrases offered do not actually address how a metaphor functions within a text as a figure of speech, but rather they substitute one figure of speech (a simile) for another (the original metaphor). Despite the creation of a literal paraphrase, questions regarding the metaphor's meaning and function remain.

Regardless of the fact that substitution and comparison theories of metaphor have largely fallen out of favor in philosophical circles, the definitions of metaphor put forth by Aristotle and Quintilian have been accepted rather uncritically by many biblical scholars as a suitable starting point for exegesis.³⁴ Perhaps this is due to the proximity of Aristotle's writings to the biblical text in comparison to contemporary theories, which at first seems to be a valid reason for applying an ancient, rather than current, theory of metaphor.³⁵ However,

-
- 31 Donald Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," in *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 478.
- 32 Black, "More About Metaphor," 22.
- 33 Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 195–22.
- 34 See further Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 8. Sadly, the developments in metaphor theory that have led to the abandonment of substitution and comparison theories have not been widely utilized by biblical scholars (e.g., Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*). Though Burke mentions Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor in addition to citing Aristotle's definition, contemporary metaphor theory does not figure in his exegesis of the metaphorical texts; so also Vanhoozer, though recognizing that "we need to respect the irreducibility of metaphor" (*Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998], 129 [emph. orig.]), argues elsewhere that what meaning can be derived from metaphor occurs when "a metaphor is successfully interpreted . . . unpacked, [and] translated into literal speech" (*ibid.*, 128).
- 35 There is a similar debate surrounding the use of ancient rhetoric or contemporary rhetoric for the analysis of biblical texts. However, ancient rhetoric was much more highly developed than ancient metaphor theory, and consequently biblical scholars who seek to employ ancient rhetorical categories to biblical texts have a large amount of raw material at their disposal. For arguments in support of using ancient rhetoric see Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 14–25; David DeSilva, *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation* (Louisville: WJK, 2009), 14–40; Ben Witherington III, *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), 5–18; for

Aristotle was concerned with providing a utilitarian description of metaphor for the improvement of style, and not with giving an account of a metaphor's mechanisms or processes.³⁶ Thus, Aristotle's theory does little to aid in the task of understanding the mechanism of metaphor. With this in mind, if we are to undertake the task of determining how biblical metaphors function to create meaning within the text, then it is wise to look beyond Aristotle and his followers for a theory that deals with a metaphor's mechanism for creating meaning rather than its stylistic purpose. As Black observes, "Looking at a scene through blue spectacles is different from *comparing* that scene with something else."³⁷ Moreover, Black's insistence that metaphors are not reducible to a literal comparison is indicative of the trend among philosophers of language and cognitive linguists to view metaphors as cognitive instruments capable of changing the structure and shape of a person's thoughts.³⁸ Thus in moving beyond comparison views we are free to entertain theories that explore how metaphors create and color our perception of their subjects.

Contemporary Theories of Metaphor

Though some deprecators of metaphor maintain the validity of comparison theories, seeing metaphor as "a sort of happy extra trick with words,"³⁹ or perhaps even more negatively, argue that metaphors serve no further function "but to insinuate wrong *ideas*, move the passions, and thereby mislead the judgment,"⁴⁰ most contemporary theorists have left comparison and substitution theories behind in favor of more robust theories. Furthermore, discussion

arguments for the use of contemporary rhetoric, see Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987): 386–403; John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (JSNTSup 163, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); Jeffrey Staley, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS 82, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

36 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 9.

37 Black, "More About Metaphor," 30.

38 More will be said about the connection between texts and readers in section 3 below. For a full discussion on metaphor and perception see chapter 3.

39 Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 90. N.b., Richards himself does not subscribe to such a sentiment.

40 John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, bk. III, chap. 10; For a good summary and critique of Locke's and Hobbes' view of metaphor see Klaus Müller-Richter, and Arturo Larcati, *Kampf der Metapher!* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 634, Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 98–107.

continues among philosophers and linguists as to the validity and merits of new theories, so this study adopts a “working theory of metaphor” and from that theory a “working definition of metaphor,” recognizing that the conversation regarding the nature and function of metaphor is far from ended. This section examines the theories of two different philosophers whose categories are utilized in the exegetical portion of this study—Black and Soskice—and offers a defense of Soskice’s definition as particularly well suited to the exegetical task.

Max Black’s Interaction Theory

Black’s “interaction theory” is still recognized as one of the first satisfactory attempts to explain metaphor as a non-ornamental feature of language with the capacity to influence cognition and perception.⁴¹ Unlike comparison and substitution theories, theories like Black’s assert that “what is said by the metaphor can be expressed adequately in no other way, that the combination of parts in a metaphor can produce new and unique agents of meaning.”⁴² Black himself sees his theory as “a help to understanding how strong metaphorical statements *work*.”⁴³ Rather than seeing a metaphor as mere ornamentation describing its underlying subject, and thus reducible to a literal paraphrase, Black argues that all metaphorical statements have a primary and a secondary subject that interact in order to create and unveil meaning for the hearer/reader.⁴⁴ As a result of ongoing discussions with other philosophers of language, Black revised his interaction theory a number of times throughout the course of his career. I will draw on his final version of the theory because of its clarifying remarks regarding a metaphor’s primary and secondary subjects. Within any given metaphor, Black sees the primary and secondary subjects interacting in the following ways:

- (a) the presence of the primary subject incites the hearer to select some of the secondary subject’s properties; and (b) invites him to construct a parallel implication-complex that can fit the primary subject; and (c) reciprocally induce parallel changes in the secondary subject.⁴⁵

41 Black, “More About Metaphor,” 38.

42 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 31.

43 Black, “More About Metaphor,” 27 (emph. orig.).

44 *Ibid.*, 35–38.

45 *Ibid.*, 28.

Thus, in using Black's example, "Marriage is a zero-sum game,"⁴⁶ the primary subject—"marriage"—interacts with the secondary subject—"a zero-sum game"—to produce an "implication complex supported by the secondary subject."⁴⁷ Black also suggests that the secondary subject "is to be regarded as a system rather than an individual thing."⁴⁸ It is important to note that in Black's view it is the combination or the "interaction" between the two subjects that constitutes the metaphor, and for Black this interaction is a cognitive event in the minds of the speaker and hearer.⁴⁹

Much of Black's theory hangs on his insistence that in a given metaphor an author uses at least one word "metaphorically" and that at least one of the remaining words in the sentence is being used "literally."⁵⁰ Black terms the word being used metaphorically the "focus," and the remainder of the metaphor the "frame."⁵¹ Thus in Black's example, "The chairman plowed through the discussion," the focus is "plowed" and the remainder of the sentence constitutes its frame.⁵² Though it is somewhat problematic for Black to speak of a single word as "being used metaphorically,"⁵³ he does make the rather helpful observation that "differences in the . . . frames will produce *some* differences in the interplay between focus and frame."⁵⁴ Thus for Black it is the combination of the focus and frame that results in a particular metaphor with a unique set of implications. This is an important insight for the study of biblical metaphor, as the context or "frame" of a metaphor is never identical, and thus an interpreter should not expect that a "focus" appearing in several texts—"frames" in Black's terminology—will yield identical implications for each context.

Black's understanding of focus and frame is seen clearly in changes of frame between slavery metaphors in Romans. For example, Paul uses δοῦλος (slave) of himself in Romans 1:1 (Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ/Paul, a slave of Christ Jesus) and also to describe the former state of the audience in Romans 6:17 (ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἀμαρτίας/ you used to be slaves of sin). Although the focus

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid., 30.

48 Ibid., 28.

49 Black asserts, "Although I speak figuratively here of the *subjects* interacting, such an outcome is of course produced in the minds of the speaker and hearer: It is they who are led to engage in selecting, organizing, and projecting" ("More About Metaphor," 28).

50 Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 28.

51 Ibid., 28.

52 Ibid., 27–28.

53 See also Soskice's critique (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46).

54 Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 28.

(δοῦλος/slave) is the same in both instances, the frames evoke slightly different sets of implications: the latter instance connotes, among other things, a greater degree of passivity than the former, and certainly the former implies a position of privilege for Paul.⁵⁵ Therefore, in interpreting biblical metaphor we cannot speak of a single meaning for a given metaphorical focus (slavery, redemption, adoption, and so on) but rather we must consider the interplay between the focus and the frame—the whole metaphorical utterance in its larger context—to determine the range of implications for each metaphor.

Emphatic and Resonant Metaphors

Though they are not typically treated as an integral part of his theory, Black's criteria for what he terms "strong" metaphors are helpful tools for analyzing and interpreting metaphors found in the biblical text. Black argues that strong metaphors have both *emphasis* and *resonance*, whereas weak metaphors "might be compared to an unfunny joke."⁵⁶ Black defines a metaphor as emphatic "to the degree that its producer will allow no variation upon or substitute for the words used," and further says, "Emphatic metaphors are intended to be dwelt upon for the sake of their unstated implications."⁵⁷ As a counterpart to "emphatic," Black defines resonant metaphors as "utterances that support a high degree of implicative elaboration."⁵⁸ Therefore, in Black's theory, the stronger the metaphor, the more likely the hearer/reader is to be struck by the juxtaposition of its two subjects and the more likely he or she is to contemplate its implication-complex.

Black's account of "strong" metaphors is entirely theoretical, but recent research in cognitive linguistics further illuminates why some metaphors are "strong" and others are "weak." Cognitive linguists have long argued that conceptual metaphors like "TIME IS MONEY," "DEATH IS ABSENCE," "LINGUISTIC EXPRESSIONS ARE CONTAINERS," "INTIMACY IS CLOSENESS," "HAPPY IS UP," (and so forth) are a system of conceptual mappings that exist in the mind.⁵⁹ Moreover, cognitive linguists argue that "metaphorical language makes use

55 Paul's use of enslavement language in the context of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors is treated in chapters 5 and 6.

56 Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 More will be said about how metaphors make meaning in the mind later in this chapter and in the next chapter. I only draw attention to it here to give an account as to why some metaphors are stronger than others. See Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3–9; 56–60.

of conceptual metaphor,” which, in the case of biblical exegesis, means that metaphors in texts are grounded in the conceptual metaphors that exist in the mind. Furthermore, cognitive linguists argue that powerful metaphors are those that already fit within a conceptual system rather than those that exist in isolation or seem to contradict core conceptual metaphors.⁶⁰

Let us take a brief example here to show the connection between Black’s work on emphasis and resonance and these insights from cognitive linguistics. The humorist Mary Hirsch quipped, “Humor is a rubber sword—it allows you to make a point without drawing blood.”⁶¹ Most will notice that this is an apt and funny way of recognizing the power of humor in the context of an argument, but we do not often pause to think about *why* this metaphor is so apt. According to Black, it is a strong metaphor because “rubber sword” cannot be easily substituted for another implement of war (emphasis), and it invites the hearer/reader to contemplate the many possible associations conjured by the metaphor (resonance). Taking a cue here from cognitive linguistics, I argue that the resonance of this metaphor is linked to its strong connection with the underlying conceptual metaphor ARGUMENT IS WAR. This conceptual metaphor grounds the implicative complex of “humor is a rubber sword,” thereby giving structure to the implications. Moreover, because “humor is a rubber sword,” is not a cliché or standard metaphor, it likely catches the reader/hearer by surprise, and therefore also likely evokes a mental simulation within the hearer/reader of fighting with rubber swords.⁶² Conversely, when literary metaphors seem to transgress the structures created by our conceptual metaphors the results appear weak—like “an unfunny joke.” Taking our example above, if someone instead said “humor is an animal cracker,” most people would have a much harder time associating these terms because of the lack of a discernable conceptual metaphor providing the underlying framework. This metaphor, in Black’s terminology, should be classified as a “weak metaphor.” If we combine Black’s insights regarding strong metaphors with insights from cognitive linguistics, then it seems that strong metaphors are those that draw upon deeply rooted conceptual metaphors and repackage them in novel, creative ways.

60 George Lakoff, “The Neural Theory of Metaphor,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 23.

61 Qtd. in Mardy Grothe, *i never metaphor i didn’t like: a comprehensive compilation of history’s greatest analogies, metaphors, and similes* (New York: Harper, 2008), 70.

62 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 196–216.

These two categories, *emphasis* and *resonance*, are helpful in evaluating the impact of a metaphor in the biblical text that is chronologically distant from the contemporary interpreter. Effective emphatic and resonant metaphors are those that draw upon conceptual metaphors using creative, novel terms that invite the reader/hearer into the implicative system created by the metaphor. Through a combination of lexical analysis and conceptual mapping it is possible to determine whether a metaphor would have been received by the audience as both emphatic and resonant, and thus a “strong” metaphor. According to Black’s theory, if a metaphor is found to be strong, then it should be treated as having a broader range of possible meanings due to its resonance, and thus be regarded as theologically significant by virtue of being emphatic. As I will show in chapter 4, the lexical data on *υιοθεσία* and the presence of the underlying conceptual metaphor COMMUNITY IS A FAMILY indicates that the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors were likely both resonant and emphatic, or in Black’s terminology, strong metaphors.⁶³

Weaknesses of the Interaction Theory

Though Black’s theory has much to commend it, there are several inadequacies that render parts of it less suitable for the task of biblical exegesis. First, Black’s theory relies on the interaction between two distinct subjects in a metaphor and sees only one of these subjects as having “metaphorical meaning.”⁶⁴ Thus, in Black’s theory metaphorical meaning is located at the level of the individual lexeme rather than at the level of a complete phrase or utterance. This proves to be problematic because, as Black himself admits, metaphors are by nature indeterminate in their meaning.⁶⁵ It follows then that under Black’s theory the meaning of a word, which Black takes to be the locus of the metaphor, is also indeterminate, but this is demonstrably false. Taking Black’s example, “Man is a wolf,” Black sees the lexeme “wolf” as having a metaphorical meaning surrounded by the literal frame. Upon closer examination however, the lexeme “wolf” does not mean something other than “large, predatory canine.” Rather, both “man” and “wolf” retain their conventional, non-metaphorical meanings,⁶⁶ and the “meaning” of the metaphor occurs at the level of the complete utterance “Man is a wolf.” This is a helpful distinction to make when dealing with the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the biblical texts, as it guards against notions of a single

63 The lexical data is treated in chapter 4.

64 Black, “More About Metaphor,” 27.

65 Ibid., 25.

66 This is precisely Davidson’s objection, “It is no help in explaining how words work in metaphor to posit metaphorical or figurative meanings” (“What Metaphors Mean,” 474).

“metaphorical meaning” for *υιοθεσία* and maintains a tight focus on the literary context of the complete metaphorical utterance in which *υιοθεσία* occurs.

Soskice also criticizes Black for his “continued insistence that each metaphor has two distinct subjects.”⁶⁷ She argues that Black’s interaction theory only works for metaphors that appear in the familiar form “X is a Y,” or Black’s “Man is a wolf,” or “Marriage is a zero-sum game.”⁶⁸ However, metaphors are not restricted to the syntactic form, “X is a Y,” and Soskice notes that Black’s theory has difficulty describing the interaction between metaphors such as “a writhing script” or “blossoms of smoke,”⁶⁹ because these metaphors lack two distinct subjects. She concludes, “To eliminate instances like these because they lack two explicit subjects would be to eliminate most of what we take to be metaphor.”⁷⁰

So too then, Black’s theory would seemingly eliminate all instances of Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors from consideration, as they also lack two distinct subjects. Indeed, in each case of a Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphor, it is difficult to formulate precisely what the two subjects of the metaphor would be under Black’s theory. Certainly Paul’s statement in Romans 8:23, “ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι (we ourselves groan inwardly, waiting eagerly for our adoption)” does not lend itself easily to analysis under Black’s theory, as *υἱοθεσίαν* is the direct object of a transitive verb, rather than something predicated of the subject. This also occurs in Galatians 4:5 where *υἱοθεσίαν* is again the direct object, and furthermore it occurs as part of a conditional clause. In Romans 9:4 *υἱοθεσία* occurs in a list of terms connected by the genitive *ὧν*, and thus the metaphor is not “X is a Y” but rather “the (metaphorical) Y belongs to X.”

The problems with Black’s limited construction are most clearly seen in attempting to render Paul’s metaphor in Romans 8:15 in the construction “X is a Y.” In Romans 8:15 Paul states, “ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας (you received the Spirit of adoption)” which again lacks two distinct subjects. Perhaps it is possible, under Black’s theory, to identify the primary subject of the metaphor as a certain unstated X which “you (pl.),” received (ἐλάβετε), which is interacting with *υἱοθεσίας* (the stated “secondary subject”) to create metaphorical meaning. But the value of that “X” is ultimately unknown, and Black’s theory provides no clarity as to what two subjects are then actually interacting to produce the metaphor. Furthermore, if we attempt to posit a value for the

67 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43.

68 Ibid., 20; Black, “More About Metaphor,” 20, 28.

69 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20–21.

70 Ibid., 20.

unknown “X,” Black’s theory quickly devolves into a comparison between the unknown “X” and “ὁ θεός.”⁷¹ To avoid this difficulty, rather than speaking of a metaphor having two distinct subjects that interact, this study will speak of a metaphor having a single subject whose meaning is *interanimated* at the level of a complete utterance, which is comprised of a tenor and a vehicle.⁷²

Janet Martin Soskice: An Interanimation Theory of Metaphor

Having already examined the inadequacies of comparison and substitution theories, and having elucidated several of the difficulties with Black’s interaction theory, we turn now to a theory that attempts to appreciate a metaphor’s unique ability to give the reader “two ideas for one,”⁷³ without speaking of a metaphor as having two distinct subjects. Soskice defines a metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another,” and from this definition we can address: (1) how a metaphor gives us its two (or more) “ideas” in a single utterance (2) the underlying models associated with these “ideas” and (3) how a metaphor’s two (or more) “ideas” come together to produce its metaphorical meaning.⁷⁴ These components of metaphorical meaning are lucidly explained and defined in a version of I. A. Richard’s “interanimation theory” put forth by Soskice.⁷⁵ I note here, however, that Soskice’s definition of metaphor is limited to identifying and analyzing metaphors as they appear within texts, and her own research on metaphor does not raise the question of how textual/linguistic metaphors might relate to conceptual metaphors in the mind. However, research from cognitive linguistics on how the mind makes meaning from linguistic utterances provides even more support for the merits of Soskice’s work on metaphor. In what follows I will combine these insights with a defense of the usefulness of Soskice’s definition for analyzing metaphors in the biblical text.

Central to Richard’s theory of metaphor is his insistence that individual word meanings are not “fixed factors with which [the author] has to build up the meaning of his sentences as a mosaic is put together of discrete independent

71 See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20; 42–43 for a further discussion of this problem.

72 The terms “tenor” and “vehicle,” coined by Richards, will be discussed in more detail below; see also Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 99–112.

73 Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93.

74 Ideally, a theory should also address the metaphor’s reception by the audience; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 44. This question will be addressed in detail in chapter 3.

75 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43–51; Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 89–112.

tesserae. Instead, they are resultants which we arrive at only through the interplay of the interpretative possibilities of the whole utterance.”⁷⁶ Thus, unlike in Black’s interaction theory, an interanimation theory of metaphor, as expounded by Richards and Soskice, holds that no single word has a metaphorical meaning, but rather the meaning of a metaphor is found at the level of a complete utterance, as it is dependent upon the interanimation of words. Richard’s theory undercuts the Aristotelian notion that individual words have “proper meaning,” a notion that lies at the heart of much of Western biblical interpretation.⁷⁷ However, one can hold to Richard’s philosophy of language without lapsing into a hopeless miasma of the metaphorical realm where there is no possibility of fixed meaning, as long as one recognizes that an utterance (whether literal or metaphorical) picks out a referent.⁷⁸

Expounding upon Richard’s foundation, Soskice further argues that a metaphorical utterance leads to “an intercourse of thoughts, as opposed to a mere shifting of words or a substitution of term for term,”⁷⁹ and that “these ‘thoughts’ can be extra-utterance without being extra-linguistic.”⁸⁰ For Soskice, “interaction” occurs in the thoughts of the reader rather than the words of the text, although she acknowledges that the thoughts of the reader are tied to the words in the utterance.⁸¹ At first blush, the close association Soskice draws between the interanimation of words and the “intercourse of thoughts” seems to impinge upon the claim that a metaphor is a feature of written or spoken language. However, under Soskice’s definition it is perfectly reasonable to understand a metaphor as a literary phenomenon *that leads to the intercourse of thoughts* since, as I argued above, literary metaphors are grounded in conceptual metaphors in the mind.⁸² Indeed, all language use, whether literal or figurative, has an essential mental component that involves discerning meaning and intention.⁸³ Thus, distinguishing between metaphors and the thoughts they evoke is no different from distinguishing between a non-metaphorical utterance and its mental interpretation by a reader. This distinction between words and thoughts is important to the interpretation of biblical

76 Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 55.

77 See Aristotle, *Cat.*, 1.16a 3.

78 In the case of figurative language there is often more than one referent possible, but to say that there are several possibilities is not tantamount to a wholly indeterminate meaning. This will be discussed in more detail in section 3.2 below.

79 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 45.

80 *Ibid.*, 45–46.

81 *Ibid.*

82 Lakoff, “The Neural Theory of Metaphor,” 24–25.

83 Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 48–49.

metaphor, and it is particularly helpful in understanding the complex relationship between a metaphorical utterance and its interpretation by a particular audience; this is a feature of metaphor that I will elucidate in greater detail in the following chapter.

Tenor and Vehicle

Rather than speaking of a metaphor having two distinct subjects, as in Black's theory, this study will use Richard's terminology of a metaphor having both a "tenor" and a "vehicle." Dawes defines "tenor" as "the subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed," and the vehicle as "the subject to which allusion is made in order to shed that light."⁸⁴ However, unlike Black's theory with its primary and secondary subjects as terms present in the metaphor, the metaphor's tenor need not be explicitly mentioned. Thus, in the following example,

A stubborn and unconquerable flame
Creeps in his veins and drinks the streams of life.⁸⁵

the metaphor's tenor is a fever, though the fever is never explicitly named as a term or a subject. Furthermore, this metaphor has several vehicles: the first is a flame, which is further described metaphorically by a second vehicle of a predator that stalks and devours its victim—and further note that both vehicles evoke a different associative network of various properties or entities of which the terms might be predicated, and these properties and entities lead to a variety of possible simulations in the mind. The flame might evoke heat, the sensation of being burned, or perhaps an object on fire, whereas that the vehicles "creeps" and "drinks" might evoke a phantasmagorical beast, a fearsome jungle cat, or a vampire.

In addition, even in instances where a tenor and a vehicle both appear as terms in the metaphor, it is still problematic to speak of a metaphor having "two subjects." For example, Alfred Lord Tennyson, in "In Memoriam," writes, "there flutters up a happy thought."⁸⁶ Here the tenor is the "thought" and the vehicle is "flutters." However, the generative capacity of a metaphor allows Tennyson's readers to think of "fluttering" in terms of a thing or things that flutter: for example, the mind might simulate visual representations of butterflies, or of delicate birds, or possibly even experience the physiological sensation of fluttering in his or her heart. Yet, none of these things or sensations

⁸⁴ Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27.

⁸⁵ Cited in Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 102.

⁸⁶ Alfred Lord Tennyson, "In Memoriam," LXV, line 7.

is an explicit “second subject” of the metaphor.⁸⁷ Though the vehicle of a metaphor may contribute a host of various associations, the full meaning of the metaphor results from the *interanimation* of the tenor and vehicle as a complete unit, and thus metaphorical meaning resides at the level of a complete utterance.⁸⁸ Therefore, Soskice’s definition of a metaphor as “speaking about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another,” recognizes that although metaphors do not have two distinct subjects, they do have two elements—tenor and vehicle—and these necessarily cooperate to create the metaphor’s meaning.

Metaphor and Model

I have already stated that a metaphor is, in some senses, to be regarded as a phenomenon of language, but also that metaphors lead to the extra-utterance intercourse of thoughts. The connection between metaphorical utterances and thoughts is upheld through the evocation of a model. Dawes states, “A model is a consistent imaginative construct or (if one prefers) a consistent pattern of thought by means of which apparently isolated phenomena may be seen to be related to one another.”⁸⁹ Thus, every metaphor has a model, or models, lurking below its surface, models that are present in the thoughts of its hearers/readers. As Black says, “every metaphor is the tip of a submerged model.”⁹⁰ If the concept of a model is combined with insights from cognitive linguistics, then a metaphor’s model is what the brain simulates when it processes a metaphor. In Tennyson’s case of a “fluttering thought,” the model for a particular hearer might be a visual representation of a butterfly or a bird, a motor simulation of fluttering, an auditory simulation of the sound of fluttering, and so forth. Thus for reader/hearers, the experience of hearing or reading a metaphor is closely tied to the model their brains simulate to make meaning of the metaphor. This close connection between metaphor as a phenomenon proper to language and models as proper to the intercourse of thoughts can be seen in the following example:

Man is but a reed, the most feeble thing in all of nature, but he is a thinking reed.⁹¹

87 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 47.

88 Ibid., 48.

89 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.

90 Black, “More About Metaphor,” 30.

91 Blaise Pascal, *The Pensées*, trans. J. M. Cohen (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961), 100.

The underlying model for Pascal's famous metaphor is evoked by its vehicle "reed," through which the hearer/reader imagines "man" through "a consistent pattern of thought"⁹² drawn from his or her images and associations of a "reed" or other "reed-like" things. The model associated with the word "reed" shapes the reader's perception of reality through the "imaginative construct" which this use of "reed" creates in the mind of the reader. Note also that the word "reed" does not obtain a special metaphorical meaning, but rather a metaphor's model draws on the associations and thought structures created by its conventional word meaning or semantic domain, and by whatever sensate experiences a reader or hearer has had with reeds that might inform their understanding of what a "reed" is.⁹³ Moreover, the metaphorical utterance itself constrains which models are associated. For example, although the lexeme "reed" could possibly evoke both a marshland plant and a woodwind instrument as models, the context clearly rules out the latter. Thus in Pascal's example, the model "reed" supplies the image of a marshland plant for the metaphor, and as the audience imagines a man in terms suggestive of a reed, the model might conjure implications like "vulnerability" or "fragility." Thus, in the exegetical process, it is crucial to identify, and in some cases rule out, the underlying model, or models of a metaphor. Only after the possible models have been identified and evaluated can the interpreter accurately assess the metaphor's possible implications created by regarding the metaphor's tenor in light of the consistent pattern of thought supplied by the vehicle and its underlying model(s).

However, it must be emphatically stated that because the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and that this meaning is ultimately bound by and "interanimated" by its literary context, it would be incorrect to assume that the "meaning" of a metaphor can be determined solely by identifying the appropriate conventional meaning of its model.⁹⁴ Not all of the attributes of the model are necessarily transferred into the metaphor. In the example above, it is unlikely that upon hearing the utterance "man is but a reed" one would conclude that men thrive most in damp habitats, though "grows in damp habitats" is part of the underlying "reed" model. It is thus quite a different thing to speak of the conventional meaning of "reed" and the metaphorical meaning of the utterance "man is but a reed." The question of metaphorical meaning is complex, and occurs in the hypnotic dance between

92 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.

93 More is said about this in the section on metaphor and meaning below.

94 This problem is also addressed by cognitive linguists. See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 257–260.

words and thoughts, in the midst of the somewhat mysterious interaction between its model, tenor, and vehicle.

Meaning and Use

Before proceeding to a praxis-oriented discussion of the interpretation of metaphor in biblical texts, we must consider one further distinction regarding the notion of “meaning.” In studies on metaphor, one often reads of a distinction between the “literal” and “metaphorical” meaning of an individual word.⁹⁵ This notion of two separate categories of meaning has been sharply questioned by Donald Davidson, who states, “metaphors mean what the words, in their most literal interpretation, mean, and nothing more. . . . [T]he central mistake . . . is the idea that a metaphor has, in addition to its literal sense or meaning, another sense or meaning.”⁹⁶ Davidson raises an apt and insightful critique regarding the nature of metaphorical language, as he is correct in asserting that the meaning of a metaphor is dependent on the words in it retaining their “literal” meaning. For example, Black’s metaphor, “man is a wolf,” becomes unintelligible if “wolf” means something other than “ferocious canine predator.” Indeed “wolf” must retain its conventional definition if it is to evoke the appropriate model as an imaginative construct for the audience. However, Davidson’s objection, though certainly helpful in clarifying some aspects surrounding the function of metaphor, is sufficiently answered so long as we speak of metaphorical meaning at the level of a complete utterance rather than as an extension of an individual word.⁹⁷

Since Davidson does highlight an important distinction between the “meaning” of individual words and the notion of “metaphorical” meaning, in the interest of clarity this study will use the term “conventional meaning” for a word’s established, commonly-used sense as evidenced by non-metaphorical contexts, and I will reserve the term “metaphorical meaning” for the meaning derived from the interanimation between the tenor and vehicle at the level of a complete phrase or utterance.⁹⁸ Since metaphorical meaning occurs as a

95 See also Black’s discussion of “focus” and “frame” (*Models and Metaphors*, 27–29).

96 Davidson, “What Metaphors Mean,” 473.

97 Indeed, as Richards notes, it is somewhat questionable to speak of a word’s “meaning” as something that exists apart from the context of an utterance, and Davidson’s challenge also suffers on these grounds (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 47–66); see also Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 60–64 for an evaluation of Davidson’s arguments.

98 Macky objects to equating literal use with conventional use because it excludes figurative uses that have become conventional (*Centrality of Metaphors*, 33–34). Macky is right to be wary of excluding figurative conventional senses, but the central issue in that case is not the distinction between literal and conventional, but between living and dead metaphor;

result of the interanimation between words, it is also necessary to determine the conventional meaning of the words in order to ascertain the implications of a metaphorical utterance.⁹⁹ Therefore, the conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία* will be treated in a separate chapter as a preliminary exercise to the exegesis and interpretation of its use in Pauline metaphors.

One further clarification on the “meaning” of a metaphor needs to be offered as a corrective to the rather misguided notion that the question “what is *X* a metaphor for?” can be answered with a single “literal” referent. To illustrate this by way of a practical example, it is not uncommon for scholars to speak of the Pauline metaphors *for salvation*,¹⁰⁰ such as justification, baptism, redemption, and adoption. However, to speak of a Pauline metaphor *for salvation* means that the interpreter wishes to hear the metaphor’s tenor “stripped of its cumbersome vehicle.”¹⁰¹ As discussed above, a metaphor’s tenor and vehicle together produce meaning at the level of an utterance, and without the highly particular combination of tenor and vehicle, one might not have the same metaphorical “sense” at all,¹⁰² nor would the resulting literal paraphrase evoke the same mental simulation as the original metaphor. If meaning is determined by the interanimation between tenor and vehicle, then the Pauline metaphors are not reducible to metaphors “for salvation;” indeed to see them as such is tantamount to returning to some version of a comparison theory of metaphor, as it assumes that there is a literal paraphrase that underlies every metaphor. Since comparison theories are generally no longer considered valid,¹⁰³ the exegetical portion of this study will not speak of *υιοθεσία* as a

see below where the progression of metaphors from living to dead is treated in greater detail.

99 In saying this I affirm Richard’s assertion that “we learn how to use words from responding to them and noting how other people use them . . . I can say equally truly, that a general conformity between users is a condition of communication” (*Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 54). This is not to say that words have a rigid and fixed sense that is somehow innate to them apart from a given context, but rather that they have a basic sense or conventional meaning that is established by their use in discourse.

100 For example, Burke states “Traditionally, New Testament scholars have understood expressions such as justification (Rom 5:1), redemption (Gal 3:13) and propitiation (Rom 3:25) as *important salvation metaphors* . . . however, there has been an increasing awareness and appreciation . . . that *huiiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the Apostle Paul” (*Adopted into God’s Family*, 37–38 [emph. mine]).

101 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 48.

102 Ibid.

103 This was discussed briefly above; for a critique of the inadequacies of comparison theories of metaphor see Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 10–15, 24–26; A. P. Martinich,

metaphor “for *X*,” which would restrict its meaning to a literal paraphrase with a single referent. Rather, for each *υἰοθεσία* metaphor I will instead posit several options for the metaphor’s tenor and explore several avenues of meaning and mental simulations that may arise from the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle. In turn, I will argue below that a metaphor’s capacity to generate multivalent meanings further manifests itself in its ability to influence the perception, emotion, and identity of the audience members.¹⁰⁴

Living and Dead Metaphors

The discussion above has tacitly assumed that all metaphors are, to some degree, recognizable as metaphors. However, most theories of metaphor acknowledge that metaphors begin to lose their “metaphoricity” over time and through repeated use, with the result that most hearers/readers do not perceive them as metaphors at all. Beardsley terms this phenomenon the loss of the “metaphorical twist,” or the novel meaning created by a metaphor.¹⁰⁵ As the novelty of the metaphor fades with increased use, the metaphor transitions from a “living” metaphor to a “retired” or “dormant” metaphor, and possibly, as in the case of words such as “muscle” or “comprehend,” to a dead metaphor.¹⁰⁶ Thus, through repeated use, a metaphor’s original “novel twist” becomes yet another conventional and established sense of the phrase in question.¹⁰⁷ Even more significant, when metaphors lose their “metaphoricity,” they “are less likely to engage the motor system than less familiar metaphorical expressions.”¹⁰⁸ Therefore, when analyzing and interpreting biblical metaphor one must consider how “alive” the metaphor would have been to its original audience in order to best ascertain its potential impact. Furthermore since

“A Theory for Metaphor,” in *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 485–96; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3–6.

104 The relationship between metaphor and perception, emotion, and identity will be examined in more detail in chapter 3.

105 Beardsley, “The Metaphorical Twist,” 301–302.

106 “Muscle” is derived from the Latin *musculus* meaning “little mouse,” and “comprehend” from the Latin *comprehendere* meaning “to grasp.” These are examples of words where the etymological history is the only trace of the original metaphor; see also Black, “More About Metaphor,” 25; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 81–83.

107 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 73–74.

108 Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 205; see also R. H. Desai, J. R. Binder, L. L. Conant, Q. R. Mano, and M. S. Seidenberg, “The Neural Career of Sensorimotor Metaphors,” *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 23 (2012): 2376–2386.

metaphors can lose their metaphoric force over time,¹⁰⁹ which would likewise mean that they fail to evoke vivid mental simulations, it is necessary to understand this process and to determine if *υἱοθεσία* had become a standard or stock metaphor for Paul's audience.

Determining the aliveness or deadness of a metaphor deals primarily with determining how much effort and reflection a reader/hearer must put forth in order to understand the meaning of a metaphorical utterance. A novel, living metaphor demands reflection in order to be understood, whereas a hearer/reader may not detect a conventional metaphor at all.¹¹⁰ Presumably, one does not often reflect on or simulate the image of an animal's tail when she hears that the taillight has gone out in her car. Nor does one often reflect first on the stem of a flower when speaking about the stem of a wine glass. These uses of language are dead metaphors in that they are "no longer secondary, no longer dependent" upon an underlying model to provide their structure.¹¹¹ To use Soskice's definition, dead metaphors no longer "speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."¹¹²

Though it has become common to speak of "living" and "dead" metaphors as static categories, upon closer examination these categories appear to be fluid and imprecise, and it may be more appropriate to add several intermediate categories to the discussion. A metaphor's journey from living to dead is much more akin to stages in the growth and development of a tadpole than to the

109 Bergen, *Louder Than Words*, 65.

110 The "metaphor as myth" theory (e.g., the work of Friedrich Nietzsche, Jacques Derrida, Colin Turbayne, and Marc Belth on metaphor) or the contention that metaphors victimize the user whenever a user is unaware she is employing them, is somewhat tangential to our discussion above. Friedrich Nietzsche's striking definition of metaphor as concealed myth is perhaps the best known and most often quoted: "What, then, is truth? A mobile army of metaphors, metonyms, and anthropomorphisms—in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, and embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical, and obligatory to a people: truths are illusions about which one has forgotten that this is what they are; metaphors which are worn out and without sensuous power; coins which have lost their pictures and now matter only as metal, no longer as coins" ("On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense" in *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann [New York: Penguin Books, 1982], 46–47); see also Jacques Derrida, "The White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," trans. F. C. T. Moore, *New Literary History* 6 (1974): 5–74; Colin Turbayne, *The Myth of Metaphor* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962); Marc Belth, *The Process of Thinking* (New York: David McKay, 1977); for several detailed evaluations of the theory see Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 74–83; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 68–72.

111 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 65.

112 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

fixed states of inorganic matter; there are identifiable characteristics at each stage of a tadpole's development, but the transitional changes between stages are gradual and somewhat unpredictable. A metaphor's transition from life to death can be thought of as a gradual, and multi-staged process. In regard to a "dead metaphor," or a metaphor whose meaning has become lexicalized, the question might be raised, "should this type of metaphor be termed a 'metaphor' at all?" Metaphor theorists have answered this question in vastly different ways. On one side of the spectrum, there are those who claim that conventional metaphors (e.g., "running water," or "weighing alternatives") continue to refer metaphorically to the original model.¹¹³ Others, like Black, claim that treating a dead metaphor as a metaphor is "no more helpful than, say, treating a corpse as a special case of a person: A so-called dead metaphor is not a metaphor at all, but merely an expression that no longer has a pregnant metaphorical use."¹¹⁴ However, both extremes are equally unhelpful for understanding how a metaphor is functioning in the biblical text: the first fails to recognize the degree to which conventional metaphors are lexicalized, and the second fails to appreciate that a speaker can still recognize and identify a dead metaphor if attention is drawn to it.¹¹⁵ Therefore, considering a metaphor's place on the continuum of "living metaphors" and "dead metaphors" is certainly useful for descriptive purposes in exegesis, even if, as Beardsley notes, "the points of transition are not clearly marked."¹¹⁶

Beardsley divides the transition of a metaphor into three parts. He describes the first stage of a metaphor as "a word and properties that are definitely not part of the intension of that word."¹¹⁷ Beardsley's first stage is what Black would term an "active metaphor," or those metaphors with "genuine metaphorical efficacy."¹¹⁸ An example of an "active metaphor" that we have already seen is Pascal's "Man is but a reed."¹¹⁹ Since human beings are not typically thought of as "reed-like," Pascal's metaphor necessitates a reader's careful thinking about human beings in terms suggestive of reeds, which means this metaphor evokes a vivid mental simulation of the model, and the reader likely must ponder

113 Lakoff and Johnson state that in order for metaphors to be truly "dead," the ideas conveyed by dead metaphors "would have to be based on inherent similarities [between the tenor and the vehicle]. But . . . such similarities are not inherent; they are themselves created via ontological metaphors" (*Metaphors We Live By*, 214).

114 Black, "More About Metaphor," 25.

115 See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.

116 Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.

117 Ibid.

118 Black, "More about Metaphor," 25.

119 Pascal, *The Pensées*, 100.

the image for awhile because the similarities are not immediately apparent. Beardsley's second stage occurs when "what was previously only a property, is made . . . into a meaning. And widespread familiarity with that metaphor, or similar ones, can fix the property as an established part of the meaning."¹²⁰ For example, terminology from sports, like "hitting one out of the park" or a "slam dunk," is frequently applied metaphorically to the realm of business; in fact metaphors in this stage have become so standard that they sound tired and cliché to most ears. Black would call this stage of the metaphor's life the "dormant" stage or metaphors "where the original, now usually unnoticed, metaphor can be usefully restored."¹²¹ Beardsley's third stage is what most would term a "dead metaphor," or when the original metaphorical property "becomes a necessary condition for applying the word in context . . . [and] constitutes a new standard sense."¹²² Metaphors in this third category are no longer actively perceived by most hearers (e.g., "running for election," the "foot of a mountain," the "boot of a car," a "computer mouse"), and no longer evoke a model and thus do not constitute a dependent use of the word.

The Importance of Tension between Model and Metaphor

It is worth pointing out that some metaphors never pass through all three stages, whereas some metaphors pass through them quite quickly. Metaphors in this latter type are what Soslke terms "metaphors devised to fill lexical gaps."¹²³ Metaphors that are created to fill gaps have an analogical, and almost imperceptible, connection to the underlying model. As the metaphor passes quickly into standard use, most native speakers do not connect the model with the metaphor any longer. However, the model can usually still be recalled upon reflection. For example, an American English-speaker can probably explain to a British English-speaker why American cars have "trunks" and not "boots" by recalling the roughly analogous "large piece of luggage" and not the "appendage of an elephant," though she most likely would not reflect on the model when speaking with another American. In cases like this one, the underlying model essentially provided a naming function, and consequently even the original metaphor had very little tension between metaphor and model,¹²⁴ and so passed quickly into a lexicalized definition.

¹²⁰ Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.

¹²¹ Black, "More about Metaphor," 25; see also Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 115–36.

¹²² Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 303.

¹²³ Soslke, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 74.

¹²⁴ See chapter 4 for a full discussion of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors and their underlying models.

Identifying this element of tension is particularly pertinent to biblical and theological metaphor, because it is sometimes difficult for a hearer to perceive tension between metaphor and model in theological contexts. Indeed, there are some metaphors that are short-lived because they provide something more akin to an analogical description rather than a novel juxtaposition of images.¹²⁵ The loss of tension between metaphor and model is particularly noticeable in mixed metaphors. Though they would offend stylistic conventions, phrases like “the shark of industry has been thrown to the wolves” or “the meek little lamb foolishly put all of her eggs in one basket” are perfectly understandable in terms of their meaning.

Mixed metaphors are considered a sin against eloquence in writing and rhetoric, but identifying them in the biblical text provides an important window into the metaphor’s aliveness or deadness for its first audience. In reference to mixed metaphors, George Orwell states, “it can be taken as certain that the writer is not seeing a mental image of the objects he is naming,”¹²⁶ and thus mixed metaphors no longer function as sensate expressions that set an image before the eyes of their audience.¹²⁷ In exegesis one must be particularly attuned to the tension between metaphor and model, especially since scholars deal so frequently with metaphors that they risk becoming desensitized to the metaphorical utterances in the biblical text. Indeed some biblical metaphors are so familiar that most readers would fail to recognize them as metaphorical utterances. For example, most people would find it much more normal to speak about God the Father as the one who protects Israel from its enemies than it would be to speak of God the Bird, even though the latter is used specifically in reference to God’s protection (Isa 31:5).¹²⁸ Biblical metaphors, such as God the Father, or Jesus as the Good Shepherd, have become such standard ways of speaking about God that few would bat an eye at the incongruities raised by the Father nursing his children (Hos 11:4), or the shepherd also being a lamb that was slain (Rev 5:6). However, a scholar must be sensitive to the amount of tension between metaphor and model in the biblical text in order to assess the metaphor’s potential for impact on its first audience.

125 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.

126 George Orwell, *Essays*, ed. John Carey (Everyman’s Library, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), 961; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73.

127 Aristotle, *Rhet.*, 1411b.

128 See also Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 53; Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*, 75–80.

Summary: A Working Definition

Though they are chronologically distant from the original setting, I have contended that contemporary definitions and theories of metaphor provide biblical scholars with a better starting place than ancient definitions and theories for seeking to explain the function and meaning of a metaphor within the biblical text. However, given the notorious problem of definition, it is not surprising that studies often proceed in their application of metaphor theory without clearly defining the term “metaphor.”¹²⁹ A few brief remarks about definition here will aid in setting clear parameters for the identification and analysis of metaphors in the biblical text. Though there are undoubtedly numerous definitions to draw from,¹³⁰ this study will rely on Soskice’s broad definition of metaphor as, “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”¹³¹ The benefits of her definition are numerous, but three are particularly relevant to its suitability for exegesis: (1) it is tightly focused on treating metaphor as a phenomenon of language, (2) it attaches metaphorical meaning closely to notions of textuality and, (3) it allows for metaphors to be present in all types of grammatical structures.

Utilizing a definition of metaphor that is closely tied to language use is particularly helpful in a study aimed at furthering the interpretation of the biblical text. This is not to say that metaphors have no impact on cognition or imagination, indeed I will argue later that they exert powerful influence over their readers and hearers in these areas through the mental simulations they evoke. Nevertheless, when dealing with metaphors embedded in a text it is helpful to utilize a definition that allows the interpreter to precisely pinpoint the metaphorical utterance as it stands in the text. Especially in theories of metaphor that emerge from cognitive linguistics, it is not uncommon to read definitions of metaphor that describe metaphors in terms of the mental events or imaginative states of the reader/hearer. Lakoff and Johnson illustrate this well in their assertion, “We have found . . . that metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical

129 For example, though Dawes’s study contains two full helpful and erudite chapters on various theories of metaphor, the term “metaphor” itself is never actually defined (*The Body in Question*, 25–78).

130 See John Searle’s 8 principles for identifying and interpreting metaphor (“Metaphor,” 104–108); also Richards, “when we use a metaphor we have two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction” (*The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93).

131 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

in nature.”¹³² However, the trouble with utilizing a *definition* of metaphor that is closely connected with thoughts or mental events for the exegesis of a text is that it becomes difficult to pinpoint the metaphor itself, since it may have been understood or processed differently by several interpreters.¹³³

Because the act of interpretation involves not only the metaphor as it stands in the text, but also draws upon the beliefs and cultural background of the hearer/reader, in order to isolate the metaphors in the biblical text it is helpful to utilize a definition that puts primacy on metaphor as a linguistic phenomenon. Soskice does this well when she states, “While it may be that the successful employment of metaphor involves non-linguistic observations, perceptions, and responses, it should not be thought that metaphor is primarily a process or mental event, and only secondarily its manifestation in language.”¹³⁴ Thus, by drawing a distinction between a metaphor as a literary phenomenon on the one hand, and on the other hand its interpretation, which involves the cognitive and imaginative states of a community of readers/hearers, we are in a better place to set identifiable parameters around the metaphor in the literary text and to evaluate its effect on the reading/hearing community.¹³⁵

It is also not atypical for the term “metaphor” to be applied, albeit at times somewhat carelessly, to an object or a state of affairs. If someone, upon gazing at a sunset, declares “the sunset is a metaphor for the end of an era,”¹³⁶ then he or she is indeed speaking metaphorically. However, the physical object of “sunset” is not the metaphor in and of itself, but rather it is the speaker’s declaration “the sunset is a metaphor” that is metaphorical. Particularly in the

132 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3.

133 For further discussion on the connection between language and cognition, see Louise Röska-Hardy, “Metapher, Bedeutung, und Verstehen,” in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 139. However, Röska-Hardy goes too far when she equates the extra-lingual interpretation by the hearer/reader with the phenomenon of metaphor itself; for a critique of Röska-Hardy see Gérard Bornet, “Metapher: (Denk-) Anstoss zum Sprachwandel Bemerkungen zum Beitrag von Louise Röska-Hardy,” in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 151–57. Rather than metaphors being extra-linguistic, Bornet argues that metaphors are “einer zweiten Sprache,” and to understand a metaphor requires a kind of multilingual (rather than extra-lingual) reasoning (*ibid.*, 152).

134 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 16.

135 For a full discussion of the relationship between metaphor and community, see chapter 3.

136 Leaving aside, for the moment, that metaphors are not really metaphors “for” something else, one could easily imagine someone speaking this example.

exegesis of a text it is important to distinguish between a metaphor as an element embedded in the text and the objects or a states of affairs it draws upon for its meaning (which form the underlying models). This distinction is particularly important for theology, where the objects and states of affairs serve as the underlying model for metaphors that often refer to a transcendent subject. For example, if someone asserted that God's act of "redemption," a state of affairs Paul predicates of believers in Galatians 4:5, was a metaphor, she would be both correct and misleading. "Redemption" as an act or a state of affairs in and of itself is *not* metaphorical, just as a sunset on its own does not constitute a metaphor, but in Galatians 4:4–5 Paul's statement ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ . . . ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (God sent his Son . . . in order to redeem those under the law) is indeed a metaphor because it occurs within a literary context. Here again, maintaining the distinction between calling the state of affairs "redemption" non-metaphorical, but calling the utterance "God sent his Son . . . in order to redeem" a metaphor allows us to contemplate the complex relationship between a metaphorical statement and the underlying model (redemption) to which it refers. Thus restricting the term "metaphor" to a literary phenomenon allows for some degree of diversity and disparity between interpretations of the metaphor that inevitably arise from differences in the perception of the underlying model between the metaphor's hearers/readers without losing sight of the metaphor itself.

Moreover, a definition of metaphor that closely ties metaphor to language rather than to an object or state of affairs guards against the tendency to transfer all of an object's properties into a metaphorical utterance. Recalling my first example, if we call the physical object "sunset" a metaphor and apply it to "the end of an era," then is it legitimate to say that the end of an era also leaves its surroundings tinged with purple, pink, and orange light? Of course such a notion seems absurd, but in theology, when objects or states of affairs rather than the utterances in which they are named, are accepted as "metaphorical," it is a much more slippery slope. For example, proponents who argue that δικαιοσύνη in Pauline literature *always* situates righteousness firmly within a forensic context have the propensity to import a detailed courtroom scene into its every occurrence.¹³⁷ However, such an action undermines the subtlety of a

137 David Williams remarks, "It is a legal metaphor that makes a quasi-legal point . . . The metaphor pictures God as the judge who has reached a decision in favor of the accused, who had been brought before God's courts, so to speak, on a charge of unrighteousness" (*Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999], 145); Michael Bird gives a good overview of the debate surrounding the precise meaning and character of δικαιοσύνη in his book, *The Saving Righteousness of God* (London: Paternoster, 2007,

metaphor's ability, as a literary phenomenon, to evoke different associations and implications for different hearers/readers in different literary contexts. In other words, though it is possible for the *δικαιοσύνη* metaphor to conjure a detailed courtroom scene in some instances (particularly where it occurs in close proximity to other legal terms), it is also possible that other *δικαιοσύνη* metaphors do not share the same level of resonance. Because the aim of this study is to exegete the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the Pauline letters, the exegetical chapters will maintain the helpful distinctions between a metaphor as figure of speech embedded in the text, the underlying models (objects and states of affairs) which hover below the surface of each metaphor, and the metaphor's impact on the mental states and imaginative constructs of its audience.

Secondly, by defining metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," we treat metaphors as phenomena of language that occur within specific and individual literary contexts. Such a definition is helpful insofar as it causes us to attend to a metaphor's surrounding context within the biblical text, and to guard against the tendency to systematize theological metaphors. Moreover, treating metaphors as a feature of textuality draws attention not only to the metaphor's immediate literary context, but also to the complex intertextual relationships that may be elicited through a metaphorical utterance.¹³⁸ In the exegetical chapters, care will be taken to appreciate the differences in the varied literary contexts in which the *υιοθεσία* metaphors appear, since Soskice's definition of metaphor roots a metaphor's meaning firmly in the text and context in which it appears. In addition, Soskice's definition also emphasizes the distinction between identifying the presence of a metaphor within a specific literary context (or an oral event), and determining its impact on the perception of the hearers/readers who contemplate the text. The distinction is subtle, but for the exegetical process it is beneficial to differentiate between the texts which contain metaphors and the minds that create their interpretation through embodied simulation.

Lastly, though Soskice's definition restricts metaphor to a phenomenon of language, it is also broad enough to allow for metaphor to occur in various grammatical and syntactical forms. As noted above, metaphors are often analyzed as if they occurred only in the form "*X is a Y*," as if the metaphorical focus

10–19). Bird's summary demonstrates that the interpretation of the biblical occurrences of *δικαιοσύνη* are pinned to a particular understanding of the word's conventional meaning, which is not necessarily synonymous with the metaphorical meaning of the utterances in which it occurs.

138 More will be said about this in the following section on metaphor and exegesis.

was always the predicate of some subject. However, it is important to recognize that Paul's declaration *πάντα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει* (the whole creation has been groaning in labor pains) (Rom 8:22) is equally metaphorical. So also is the subjunctive *ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν* (in order that we might receive adoption as sons) (Gal 4:5), as metaphors can occur in any mood. Identifying that metaphors are not limited to a particular grammatical or syntactic form provides a safeguard against the tendency in exegesis to literalize the metaphorical language of passages that deviate from the form "X is a Y."¹³⁹ As Soskice notes, "Metaphor displays no one syntactic form because the criteria by which it is distinguished are not merely syntactic, but semantic and pragmatic as well."¹⁴⁰

Metaphor and Exegesis

Because this study is concerned with the interpretation of biblical metaphor, this section will elucidate several areas of special concern that arise from the intersection of contemporary metaphor theory and biblical exegesis. In recent years there have been several studies devoted specifically to the task of interpreting biblical metaphors in light of contemporary metaphor theory,¹⁴¹ and this study will both utilize and build upon their insights and advancements in biblical interpretation. Because the second half of this study is concerned with the interpretation of a specific set of Pauline metaphors (utterances which use *υἰοθεσία*), and previous studies written on the interpretation of this metaphor

139 There is a troubling trend among some theologians to force biblical metaphors into literal categories, as some do not recognize biblical metaphors as metaphorical at all. Tim Trummer makes the rather puzzling comment regarding the biblical language of adoption and new birth, "Supposing these two elements are non-metaphorical realities, then there is a divine logic that surpasses a human understanding of birth and adoption" ("An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition," University of Edinburgh: Ph. D. Diss., 2001), 83. Similarly, Ivor Davidson remarks "*Huiiothesia* is no mere metaphor; it specifies a genuine transformation that has occurred and will occur for them in virtue of who he is and what he has done" ("Salvation's Destiny: Heirs of God," in *God of Salvation: Soteriology in Theological Perspective*, ed. Ivor J. Davidson and Murray A. Rae [Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011], 164).

140 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 19.

141 E.g., Aasgaard, "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters;" Dawes, *The Body in Question*; Nijay Gupta, "Towards a Set of Principles for Identifying and Interpreting Metaphors in Paul: ΠΡΟΣΑΤΩΓΗ (Romans 5:2) as a Test Case," *ResQ* 51.3 (2009): 169–81; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors*; Sallie McFague, *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).

have largely sought to pinpoint a specific meaning (often via the identification of its correct background), the primary aim of the following section is to challenge several of the presuppositions related to the interpretation of metaphor that lead to some erroneous conclusions in exegesis. Therefore, the following section will focus specifically on the relationship between metaphor, context and intertextuality, the indeterminacy of metaphorical meaning, and the relationship between metaphor and epistemology.

Text, Context, Intertextuality, and Metaphorical Meaning

The relationship of metaphor and literary context is of particular significance for the interpretation of biblical metaphors. This is an especially needed corrective for the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors, as previous studies have been too heavily focused on establishing their correct background and tended to pay little attention to how Paul is using the metaphors within the texts themselves.¹⁴² Moreover, although several studies have identified potential intertextual connections between Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphors and other texts, no study has seriously examined how these texts, and the metaphors embedded in them, interact with one another, or analyzed Paul's role as an interpreter of the sonship motif in Israel's Scriptures and tradition. There has also been a tendency in previous studies on the *υιοθεσία* metaphors to import the meaning from one metaphorical context to another without giving adequate thought to how metaphorical meaning is produced. Therefore, several observations regarding metaphor, text, context, and intertextuality must be made prior to the exegetical process if we are to properly integrate metaphor theory and biblical interpretation: (1) determining the "appropriate background" (either through "background" texts or historical background) and conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία* does not automatically yield the meaning of the Pauline metaphors where *υιοθεσία* occurs, (2) the intertextual relationships between the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors and other texts are dynamic and complex, and (3) we cannot speak of the Pauline meaning of the "*υιοθεσία* metaphor" in total, but rather we must speak of the various meanings and implications that arise from the individual occurrences of *υιοθεσία* metaphors, as metaphorical meaning is not necessarily transferred between literary contexts.

Metaphor and "Background"

The bulk of the research that has been published on the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors has been focused on determining the appropriate conventional

142 E.g., Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; this issue is discussed in more detail in chapter 1.

meaning and background of υιοθεσία. In older studies it was largely taken for granted that the Roman practices of adoption were the appropriate background of υιοθεσία.¹⁴³ This tenet was challenged by Byrne, who argued that υιοθεσία should be understood as meaning “sonship” rather than “adoption,”¹⁴⁴ and is best interpreted as a continuation of the “sonship” motif found in Jewish literature. Although Scott’s extensive analysis of the adoption word-group (υιοθεσία, εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, τίθεσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) determined that the most appropriate translation of υιοθεσία is “adoption to sonship,” and that the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία derived from its use in Roman and Greek adoption practices,¹⁴⁵ he too sees Jewish texts (esp. 2 Sam 7:14) and a Jewish adoption formula as the appropriate background for its use in the Pauline corpus. Notably, these previous studies, which are largely focused on identifying the background, to varying degrees operate under the assumption that a metaphor’s meaning can be determined by surveying and analyzing the existing senses of the words used in the metaphorical utterance.

However, I have argued in the first part of this chapter that metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance, which means that a metaphor’s meaning is not determined by “adding up” the conventional meanings of the words it employs. Dawes notes that studies that seek to determine the metaphorical meaning of an utterance by establishing the correct conventional meaning of a controversial word “fall into some serious errors.”¹⁴⁶ He goes on to say that “confusion . . . arises first of all from a failure to distinguish two operations. The first is the translation of a word. The second is the spelling out of the sense of its metaphorical use.”¹⁴⁷ Therefore, while background studies are helpful insofar as they delineate the conventional meanings of words, it does not necessarily follow that all of the properties of the conventional meaning of the vehicle will be transferred to the primary subject (tenor) of the metaphor.

Metaphor and Context

To illustrate that the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a full utterance and is therefore contextually bound, let us look at several examples of biblical metaphors that utilize the same lexeme as their vehicle. Athletic metaphors, especially metaphors evocative of running and footraces, occur in

143 See Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 67–99, for a sustained defense of this view; more recently, see Lewis, *Paul’s “Spirit of Adoption,”* 13–19.

144 Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 183.

145 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv.

146 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 126.

147 Ibid.

many places in the Pauline corpus, many of which employ various forms of the lexeme *τρέχειν*. The conventional meaning of *τρέχειν* is defined as “to make rapid linear movement, *run, rush, advance*,” “to exert oneself,” or “to proceed quickly without restraint.”¹⁴⁸ *Τρέχειν* is the vehicle of the metaphors present in Galatians 5:7, 1 Corinthians 9:24–26, and Romans 9:16 but each of these metaphors has slightly different meaning. Furthermore, these examples show that the same vehicle can be used to create strong and weak metaphors, depending on its combination with the metaphor’s tenor and frame. In 1 Corinthians 9:24–26 *τρέχειν* is used as part of an extended metaphor, which states:

Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες πάντες μὲν τρέχουσιν, εἰς δὲ λαμβάνει τὸ βραβεῖον; οὕτως τρέχετε ἵνα καταλάβητε. πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται, ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν ἵνα φθαρτὸν στέφανον λάβωσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄφθαρτον. ἐγὼ τοίνυν οὕτως τρέχω ὥς οὐκ ἀδήλως, οὕτως πυκτεύω ὥς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων.

Do you not know that in a race the *runners* all compete (*run*), but only one receives the prize? *Run* in such a way that you may win it. Athletes exercise self-control in all things; they do it to receive a perishable wreath, but we an imperishable one. So I do not *run* aimlessly, nor do I box as though beating the air.

In this context the metaphor is well developed, and it is clear from the context that it is specifically running in a competition that is in view as the metaphor’s vehicle as evidenced by the inclusion of ἐν σταδίῳ (racecourse) and other athletic events such as boxing (πυκτεύειν). The tenor of 1 Cor 9:24–26 is not explicitly mentioned, but the most likely candidate is the idea of “moral self-control” given the wider context of the letter (e.g., 1 Cor 8:1–13).¹⁴⁹ However, it is not accurate to say that this passage is a metaphor *for* self-control, as *τρέχειν* (to run) might also evoke associations regarding obtaining eternal life, or maintaining faithfulness to the gospel message. The context of 1 Corinthians 9:24–26 creates a strong metaphor and allows for multivalent readings and several metaphorical “meanings” that occur at the level of the full metaphorical

148 BDAG, 1015 (emph. orig.).

149 See Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 708–717 for a detailed exegetical analysis of 1 Cor 9:24–26 with “self-control” as a framework for interpretation.

utterance—meanings that are not necessarily present in other metaphorical utterances where *τρέχειν* (to run) appears as the vehicle.

Galatians 5:7 also contains a metaphorical use of *τρέχειν* (to run), and there the metaphor is not quite as strong as the example from 1 Corinthians 9:24–26. Here Paul exclaims Ἐτρέχετε καλῶς· τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν [τῇ] ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; (You were running well! Who hindered you from obeying the truth?) in reference to the issue of circumcision and law-keeping, which in this example is the tenor of the metaphor. Most commentators agree that *τρέχειν* (to run) brings to mind images and simulations of an athletic footrace,¹⁵⁰ though the absence of other accompanying images from athletic contests leaves open the possibility for the audience to associate or simulate other potential models. Furthermore, the shift in frame between 1 Corinthians 9 and Galatians 5 produces a different set of implications or meanings for the metaphor in which *τρέχειν* (to run) is used. Where *τρέχειν* (to run) in 1 Corinthians highlights the connection between athletics and self-discipline, in Galatians *τρέχειν* (to run) stresses the link between athletics and “fair play,” or the continual adherence to correct doctrine.

Taking Romans 9:16 as a third example, which reads, ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ (Therefore it depends not on [human] willing or “running,” but on God who shows mercy) we see an even weaker metaphor using *τρέχειν* (to run) as its vehicle. Here the vehicle *τρέχοντος* (running) is used in conjunction with *θέλοντος* (willing) which leads most translators to elide the “running” metaphor and replace it with a gloss like “human effort” or “human exertion.” However, in the larger context of election in Romans 9:6–17, it is possible that Paul’s audience heard overtones of an athletic contest as it pertains to election in Romans 9:16. Namely, that election is *not* an athletic contest, where victory can be secured through human performance, but rather is bestowed wholly in God’s mercy (Rom 9:16b).¹⁵¹ However, given that this particular frame lacks the specifics of 1 Corinthians, it is also possible that *τρέχειν* (to run) here associates other “running” things or things that require human effort. It is also quite possible that this was neither intended nor received as a particularly strong metaphor, and that Paul’s audience did not actively contemplate election in terms seen to be suggestive of running a footrace (*τρέχειν*), but rather “human exertion” had become, for most, a conventional meaning of the word.

150 E.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 264–65; see also J. Louis Martyn, who translates Gal 5:7 “for some time you ran a good footrace,” (*Galatians* [AB, New York: Doubleday, 1997], 474).

151 For an interesting discussion on simulation and negation see Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 53–59.

There are, most certainly, some overlapping implications between these three contexts, but there are also three distinctly different sets of “meanings” produced by the three uses of τρέχειν (to run) in different metaphorical contexts. What these examples demonstrate is that not only are there multiple meanings possible within a given context, but that these meanings do not necessarily transfer between contexts even when the same word is being used as the vehicle of the metaphor. Therefore it is problematic to speak of τρέχειν (to run) having “metaphorical meaning” as an individual lexeme,¹⁵² and an exegete must be prepared to embrace a multivalence of meanings for lexemes that occur in several separate metaphorical contexts within the biblical text. This issue seems rather benign when speaking of athletic imagery, but the connection between metaphorical meaning and context is a potential stumbling block for interpreting υιοθεσία, whose theological “meaning” has been explained historically by synthesizing all of its New Testament occurrences into a single definition. Applying contemporary metaphor theory to the υιοθεσία metaphors, and thereby binding metaphorical meaning tightly to a specific context, admonishes the exegete to “hear the voices” from each occurrence of the metaphor, and hold their meanings in tension if necessary.

Metaphor and Intertextuality

Because several of the monographs on the background of the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία have focused on identifying its background from Old Testament and intertestamental texts, it is necessary here to include a few brief remarks about the intersection between metaphor theory, model and intertextuality. Manfred Pfister remarks, “Die Theorie der Intertextualität ist die Theorie der Beziehungen zwischen Texten. Dies ist unumstritten; umstritten jedoch ist, welche Arten von Beziehungen darunter subsumiert werden sollen.”¹⁵³ Pfister’s observation is especially poignant for biblical studies, where the term “intertextuality” is often bandied about,¹⁵⁴ but there is little agreement on a precise theory of intertextuality and frequently a certain lack

152 John Searle remarks that this type of thinking common to semantic interaction and comparison theories results from “the failure to appreciate the distinction between sentence or word meaning, which is never metaphorical, and speaker or utterance meaning, which can be metaphorical” (“Metaphor,” 90).

153 Manfred Pfister, “Konzepte der Intertextualität,” in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 11.

154 Christopher B. Hays is probably correct in observing that intertextuality is best thought of as a category of methodologies rather than a specific methodology (“Echoes of the Ancient Near East?: Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament,” in *The Word*

of precision as to its meaning. Furthermore, many biblical scholars utilize “intertextual” methodologies which are often quite foreign to Julia Kristeva’s original theory of intertextuality.¹⁵⁵ Moreover, for some scholars, the term “intertextuality” is unfortunately little more than “a modern literary theoretical coat of veneer over the old comparative approach.”¹⁵⁶ However, for her part, Kristeva envisaged intertextuality as the study of a text “within [the text of] society and history.”¹⁵⁷ Quite distinct from studies that treat intertextuality as little more than an exercise in “source hunting,”¹⁵⁸ Kristeva’s definition of “text” is much wider and includes also the notion of culture as “the general text” which acts as another dialogue partner with precursors and successors, making it a particularly adaptable and useful theory for examining the intertextual relationships between the metaphors embedded in the biblical texts.¹⁵⁹

Kristeva’s method was primarily interested in the transposition of textual patterns “from one signifying system to another.”¹⁶⁰ In her view, this transposition was essentially an ideological exercise by the author.¹⁶¹ Moreover, according to Kristeva’s theory, texts are not merely a reflection of history and culture, but rather texts affect history and culture, and “insert themselves into it.”¹⁶²

Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays, eds. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kevin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 26).

- 155 For a good overview and critique of the development of intertextuality see Pfister, “Konzepte der Intertextualität,” 1–30; Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12–28.
- 156 Ellen van Wolde, “Trendy Intertextuality?” in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Drasma (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989), 43; for a defense of the legitimacy of “intertextuality” as a distinct mode of inquiry see Bern Schulte-Middelich, “Funktionen intertextueller Textkonstitution,” in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 197–242.
- 157 Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 37.
- 158 Kristeva writes that intertextuality is not concerned with “le sens banal de ‘critique des sources’” (*La révolution du langage poétique* [Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974], 31).
- 159 *Ibid.*, 94–100.
- 160 *Ibid.*, 60.
- 161 Ulrich Broich argues a similar concept, observing that intertextuality is present when an author conscientiously employs a precursor text and also expects his or her readers to recognize the intended use of the text in its new context (“Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität,” in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister [Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985], 31).
- 162 Julia Kristeva, “Narration et Transformation,” *Semiotica* 1 (1969): 443; see also Hays, “Echoes of the Ancient Near East?,” 29–31.

Though some have sought to portray Kristeva's method as ahistorical,¹⁶³ one of her stated goals was to situate a text in history, and moreover her methodology emphasizes the author as the agent who is responsible for the transposition of texts. This is not to say that the author has absolute control over the meaning that his or her texts create, but rather to recognize that without the author there would be no text. Although some have alleged that Kristeva's understanding of a text is too broad to be useful for intertextual inquiry in literature,¹⁶⁴ her definition of intertextuality need not lead to an entirely indeterminate or nebulous inquiry of intertextual relationships,¹⁶⁵ even if the authorial intention is to some degree unrecoverable. Rather, Kristeva's insistence of an author's intentionality in transposing texts can be combined with the notion that texts themselves to some degree constrain the intertextual relationships that they elicit.¹⁶⁶ An intertextual hermeneutic that emphasizes authorial intentionality and textual restraints aids in the exegesis of Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphors in particular because, from the outset, these parameters present Paul as a careful and intentional interpreter, rather than a mere appropriator of precursory texts.

Though they do not state it outright, both Scott and Byrne approach the question of Paul's background with the somewhat reductionist assumption that intertextuality is restricted to the diachronic dimension of a text, and that it is confined to the identification of the literary sources and influences that lie behind a given text. In seeking to pinpoint the precise influences and traditions that have informed the Pauline use of *υιοθεσία*, both Scott and

163 E.g., Robert L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 4; Jacob Neusner, *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism* (Studies in Judaism, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987), xiii. For a different perspective, see Michael Riffaterre, who claims that rather than intertextuality giving rise to a plurality of possible readings, the intertext "provides the clue to interpretation by canceling the undecidable reading" ("Interpretation and Undecidability" *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 233.

164 See esp. Tegtmeier, "Der Begriff der Intertextualität," 51–56; Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12–19.

165 This is the German school's critique of Kristeva; e.g., Broich claims, "Wenn man den Begriff der Intertextualität in einem so weiten Sinn verwendet, dass jeder Text in all seinen Elementen intertextuell ist, verliert der Begriff seine Trennschärfe und damit seine wissenschaftliche Brauchbarkeit zumindest für die Analyse einzelner Texte" ("Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität: Zur Einzeltextreferenz," in *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985), 48; see also Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 12–19; Tegtmeier, "Der Begriff der Intertextualität," 51–56.

166 Holthuis makes this argument in some detail (*Intertextualität*, 180).

Byrne share much in common with studies that treat intertextuality as, in W. W. Hallo's words, "a text's dependence on and infiltration by prior codes, concepts, conventions, unconscious practices and texts . . . as such it replaces or complements synchronic by diachronic considerations."¹⁶⁷ However, Hallo's limited definition, key elements of which are seen in both Byrne's and Scott's methodology, does not adequately capture the complexities most practitioners of intertextual methods identify as inherent in using an intertextual approach. Instead, intertextual relationships are dynamic, and texts function within a web or matrix of other texts, which themselves can only be understood in relation to other texts.¹⁶⁸ Steve Moyise aptly remarks, "Each new text disturbs the fabric of existing texts as it jostles for a place."¹⁶⁹

An intertextual approach to metaphors must seek to appreciate the mosaic of relationships between texts and the metaphors embedded within them.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, if Soskice's theory of metaphor focuses on the interanimation of words, then in using Kristeva's theory, perhaps by extension we can approach metaphor and intertextuality as an examination of the interanimation of texts in the intertextual space. In order to provide a concrete example for my conception of "intertextual space," I offer the following analogy. Off the northwesternmost point of New Zealand, at Cape Reinga, the waters from the Tasman Sea and the Pacific Ocean collide into one another creating a swirling current of unsettled waters just off the coast. As the waters meet, the waves jostle for

167 W. W. Hallo, "Proverbs Quoted in Epic," in *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. Tzvi Abusch, John Huehnergard, Piotr Steinkeller (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 203; see also Radu Gheorghita, *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3–4 in Heb 10:37–38* (WUNT II 160, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003). Gheorghita distinguishes between traditional intertextuality which is a "static and diachronic concept, which depicts various ways in which authors make use of previously written texts," and postmodern intertextuality which argues that a "precursor text can never be just a simple presence in the successor text" (*ibid.*, 73, n. 6).

168 See also Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 23.

169 *Ibid.*

170 Pace Broich's assertion that the "hard core (harten Kern)" of intertextuality lies "in denen sich ein Text auf einen bestimmten, individuellen Prätext bezieht, wobei dann auch der Begriff des Textes in einem engen Sinn zu verwenden wäre" ("Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität," 48). Under Broich's narrow definition of "text" the Pauline *υιοθεσία* texts seemingly would not fit the criteria for intertextual inquiry at all; for a critique of Broich's thesis and a defense of typological intertextual relationships see Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 51–88.

place, some swirling into large whirlpools, and some relentlessly marching headlong into the waves from the opposing current. Rather than being static entities, texts interanimated in the intertextual space react to one another in much the same way. Some precursor texts might relentlessly march forward into the successor texts, dominating the landscape of their new setting. Other precursor texts might intermingle more gently with successor texts, creating a new set of serene ripples. Still others might interact in a tumultuous current, creating a whirlpool of meaning which transforms both precursor and successor texts. This process of interanimation looks different each time it plays out in the intertextual space, and thus one must attend carefully not only to what precursor texts are present in successors, but also to how these texts interact with one another to produce new figuration.

Speaking about intertextuality as the “interanimation of texts” also brings clarity to a particular issue involved with the exegesis of Paul’s *υιοθεσία* metaphors, which is that the *υιοθεσία* metaphors do not have any precise literary parallels with any texts in the Old Testament or intertestamental sources.¹⁷¹ Though previous studies have treated the intertextual relationships between the Pauline *υιοθεσία* texts and precursors in a manner that smoothed out the differences between *υιοθεσία* and other metaphors in the precursor texts, I would suggest that what is needed is an understanding of intertextuality that seeks meaning in the intersection of the competing metaphors (e.g., “adoption,” “sons,” and “firstborn”) that are “jostling for a place.”

A brief example of how a metaphor might function in the interanimation of texts will bring some clarity to the complexities involved in interpreting the intertextual relationships evoked through metaphors. In John 6:35 Jesus uses the metaphor Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς (I am the bread of life), which in the wider context of John 6 is an explicit reinterpretation of YHWH’s provision of manna in the exodus event (Exod 16:1–36; Ps 78:24).¹⁷² Although John 6 does contain several direct quotations and allusions to Exodus 16 (e.g., John 6:31, 41, 49, 58), it is insufficient to conclude that the meaning of the metaphor Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς can be constructed out of the precursor text in Exodus 16. Rather, the meaning of Jesus’ metaphor occurs in the collision of texts where YHWH is the provider of manna for the Israelites and John’s

¹⁷¹ This will be discussed in detail in chapter 4 and in chapter 7.

¹⁷² Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989); Leon Morris, *The Gospel of John* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 320; *pace* Herman Ridderbos, who argues that the Bread of Life Discourse is a general reference to the assuaging of hunger and thirst (*The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 229).

new metaphor describing Jesus' personal identity (Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς) in the intertextual space. The meaning of the metaphorical utterance lies in the interanimation between the precursor texts and John's new metaphor; it lies in the appropriation and reinterpretation of these images as a marker of his identity as the Son of Man (John 6:53). So too, the intertextual connections evoked by the Pauline υἱοθεσία metaphors are interanimated in the intertextual space where text speaks to text to create rich and multivalent layers of metaphorical meaning.

Whereas monographs that focus on identifying the "background" from precursor texts view intertextuality as a primarily diachronic relationship, viewing intertextuality as an interanimation of texts seeks to understand how Paul's appropriation of the precursor texts might be working synchronically with his υἱοθεσία metaphors to create meaning for his audience.¹⁷³ Rather than isolating a single underlying model for the "background" of the metaphors drawn from diachronic relationships with precursor texts, the interanimation theory of metaphor and intertextuality this study utilizes leaves room for various intertextual relationships that contain layers of possible images, and for those texts and models to reinterpret one another. Therefore, in the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors I will treat potential intertextual relationships as dynamic and synchronic, finding the meaning in the subtleties and "whispered or unstated correspondences"¹⁷⁴ interanimated in the intertextual space.

Meaning is Indeterminate

Traditionally, the task of historical-grammatical exegesis was to arrive at the "correct" interpretation of the text based on its grammatical analysis, cultural background, setting, location, and a host of other quantifiable factors.¹⁷⁵ In keeping with this trend, the goal of many interpreters of biblical metaphor is to explain the metaphor's meaning using a literal paraphrase, which I have already shown to be problematic. Indeed Ricoeur argues, "real metaphors are not translatable . . . This is not to say that they cannot be paraphrased, just that such a paraphrase is infinite and incapable of exhausting the innovative

173 Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6 (emph. mine).

174 Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 20.

175 Richard Coggins has a rather insightful and enjoyable analysis of this phenomenon in his paper, "A Future for the Commentary?" in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies*, ed. Francis Watson (London: SCM Press, 1993), 163–75.

meaning.¹⁷⁶ If Ricoeur is correct, then the notion of a single “correct” interpretation is also problematic, as the nature of a metaphor is to yield some degree of indeterminacy in its meaning. Martinich notes that this indeterminate-ness “is not a defect,” but rather it “is one of the more intriguing features of metaphors; it is what encourages the audience to play with and explore the concepts involved—to look for relationships between things not previously countenanced.”¹⁷⁷ Moreover, research in cognitive linguistics suggests that one of the possibilities for our inability to paraphrase metaphors is that they activate sensate simulations in the brain that cannot be captured by nonsensate language. If meaning is embodied simulation, then the meaning of a sentence like “run with perseverance the race set before you” is bound up in the mental simulation of running, with all of its attendant feelings and experiences of exhilaration, determination, exhaustion and so forth. These sensate “meanings” are lost if the sentence is repackaged in abstract terms like “keep diligently following the faith throughout your whole life.”¹⁷⁸ However, this is not to say that all readings of a metaphor are “good readings” or that all readings are equally valid, but rather to point out that a metaphor might have a range of valid meanings or interpretations rather than a single, univocal paraphrase.

In taking our example above, Pascal’s “Man is but a reed,” a whole range of possible meanings is immediately apparent (e.g., man is thin, frail, hollow, fragile, tender, or “someone who is blown around by the wind”),¹⁷⁹ and no single meaning from this range can be held up as the “correct” meaning to the exclusion of the others, since there is no way to precisely limit what any given person simulates when he or she hears the words “man is but a reed.” Neither is the “meaning” of this metaphor a completely stable entity that can be determined by correctly identifying what Pascal as the author “meant” when he wrote, “Man is but a reed.” Supposing that a metaphor’s meaning can be determined by an appeal to authorial intent usually also presumes that the author also “meant” some literal paraphrase that underlies the metaphor, rather than accepting that what the author “meant” to write was the metaphor as it stands

176 Paul Ricoeur, *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976), 52.

177 Martinich, “A Theory for Metaphor,” 490.

178 I note here that it is nearly impossible to empty language of sensate terms so that a sentence evokes no mental simulation of movement, images, or audiation. Even in my repackaged sentence the verb “follow” would likely activate the motorsensory portion of the brain. My point here is that changing the metaphor results in a different, and often-times less vivid, mental simulation.

179 I am grateful for my friends at the University of Otago for their contributions to this list of meanings.

in a given text. If, therefore, we presume that an author intentionally employs a metaphor, we must also accept that he or she invites some degree of indeterminacy in the meaning of the text based on its reception by the reader. As Davidson remarks, "Metaphor is the dreamwork of language and, like all dreamwork, its interpretation reflects as much on the interpreter as on the originator."¹⁸⁰ Furthermore, the interpretations of a metaphor can shift and change slightly each time an individual reader returns to the text, and they certainly vary to some degree between readers. Perhaps then it is appropriate to conceive of a metaphor having a cluster of meanings, or of its meaning having somewhat "ragged edges" around a more stable center.¹⁸¹

For biblical exegesis then, the indeterminacy of metaphor has the potential to be an exciting feature of the text, opening up new avenues of meaning that may have been previously excluded from consideration, but if it is carried too far it becomes a black hole, sucking the interpreter into an infinite gloom where meaning remains an entirely elusive concept. Vanhoozer remarks, "Metaphors are equivocal; they do not have one clear sense, so that they cannot give rise to clear and distinct knowledge. . . . [I]n metaphor, meanings refuse to stand still."¹⁸² Fortunately, as Vanhoozer also observes, "we need not choose between a meaning that is wholly determinate and a meaning that is wholly indeterminate."¹⁸³ Again taking Pascal's example, we notice that though there is a range of possible meanings, each of these meanings relies on a connection between the metaphor and its underlying model—that is, each meaning is derived from the intersection of thinking of a man in terms seen to be suggestive of a reed. Furthermore, features of a reed that are inappropriate for transfer to a human being, such as "grows in damp places," or "utilizes photosynthesis," are not countenanced. So while Ricoeur is correct in saying that metaphor is in some ways non-translatable, it does not follow that it is unintelligible to the hearer/reader. Since meanings are derived from thinking of "one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" (or in thinking of the tenor in terms appropriate to the vehicle), we need only consider meanings that are derived from the properties possessed by the metaphor's underlying model. Thus, while all metaphors, including biblical metaphors, are to some degree indeterminate, they still have a limited range of possible meanings

180 Davidson, "What Metaphors Mean," 473.

181 Vanhoozer makes a similar claim, calling for what he terms "adequate interpretation" (*Is There a Meaning in This Text?*, 139–40).

182 Ibid., 127.

183 Ibid., 139.

that are available for consideration based on identifying and associating the model(s) which underlie the metaphor.

In addition to the indeterminacy of a metaphor being limited by its underlying model, the literary context also often provides limitations for the possibilities of meaning. Pascal's metaphor, "Man is but a reed," occurs in a larger discussion about the connection between thought and humanness. Indeed, just before his famous metaphor, Pascal concludes that "thought is the greatness of man" and just after he notes that "the entire universe need not arm itself to crush him."¹⁸⁴ Therefore, while there is still a range of possible associations, the immediate context of the metaphor under examination causes the reader to pick out the associations connected with fragility, and to simulate corresponding "fragile" models. However, the precise associations conjured by thinking of man in terms seen to be suggestive of the fragile reed model are still impossible to fix determinately from reader to reader. In light of these conclusions, this study aims to embrace the indeterminacy of metaphor by speaking of a range of possible implications drawn from considering the possible models underlying the vehicle "ὕψοθεσία," and the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle considered against the context (the frame) of the ὕψοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians, while also recognizing that the implications given may or may not be present for all readers at all times.

Metaphor and Epistemology

Literal and Metaphorical Truth

There is a strong trend in the Western philosophy born of the Enlightenment that puts a high premium on "literal" truth and asserts, as Locke puts it, that metaphors "in all discourses that pretend to inform or instruct, [are] wholly to be avoided and, where truth and knowledge are concerned, cannot but be thought a great fault either of the language or person that makes use of them."¹⁸⁵ Thus, what philosophers have deemed "metaphorical truth" is truth or knowledge of a lower class and inferior nature. This distinction implies

¹⁸⁴ Pascal, *The Pensées*, 100.

¹⁸⁵ Locke, *Essay*, bk. III, chap. 10; see also Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, pt. 1. chap. 4 "On Speech;" Bertrand Russell, *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901–1950*, ed. Charles Marsh (London: Allen & Unwin, 1956), 178–89; Ludwig Wittgenstein, *The Wittgenstein Reader*, ed. Anthony Kenny (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 70–83; for an overview of metaphor in the philosophy of the Enlightenment see Oliver R. Scholz, "Wit und Regeln: Metaphern und ihre Auslegung in der Philosophie der Aufklärung," in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprach und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 39–52.

that “metaphorical truths” are really, at their root, literal truths mediated and communicated—and somehow obscured—through metaphor. However, the dichotomy of “literal” and “metaphorical” truth is a false one, and Wilhelm Köller argues that the real issue lies not only with metaphor, but with “das Problem des Verhältnisses der Sprache zur aussersprachlichen Wirklichkeit.”¹⁸⁶ As Black observes, “an emphatic, indispensable metaphor does not belong to the realm of fiction, and is not merely being used, as some writers allege, for some mysterious aesthetic effect, but really does say something.”¹⁸⁷ Indeed, cognitive theorists have argued convincingly that metaphors are creative rather than merely descriptive—that is, they are capable of shaping how a person conceives of reality;¹⁸⁸ a truly creative metaphor communicates truths which have no literal paraphrase. Furthermore, if meaning is tied to embodied simulation, then metaphors may actually express truth *more poignantly* than abstract “literal” language. However, this is an emerging area of research in cognitive linguistics, and more work must be done before conclusions can be drawn regarding the role of embodied simulation in processing abstract language.¹⁸⁹ Suffice to say here that our brains process metaphorical language in much the same way that they process non-metaphorical language, which is by activating various regions of our brains to simulate whatever the language depicts.

However, it is also worth bearing in mind that although a speaker utilizing a metaphor aims at truth,¹⁹⁰ it does not follow that all of the properties of the metaphor’s underlying model necessarily refer. For example, in taking the metaphor “it’s a zoo out there,” to describe a busy day at the shopping mall, a person at once grasps the chaotic scene without simultaneously being concerned that she will be trampled to death by elephants. Nevertheless, in equating a shopping mall with a zoo, this metaphor creates much stronger associations and simulations than does the non-metaphorical sentence “the mall is extremely busy.” It is also certainly not accurate to conclude that the person who utters “it’s a zoo out there” is speaking falsely simply because all aspects of the underlying zoo model fail to refer. Both “it’s a zoo out there” and “the mall is extremely busy” aim at communicating truth, but the truth communicated

186 Wilhelm Köller, *Semiotik und Metapher: Untersuchungen zur grammatischen Struktur und kommunikativen Funktion von Metapher* (Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft 10, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1975), 28.

187 Black, “More About Metaphors,” 39.

188 E.g., Black, “More About Metaphors,” 38; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 3–10.

189 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 221–222.

190 Martinich, “A Theory for Metaphor,” 486.

through the metaphor is creative and requires some level of interpretation from the hearer. So although truths communicated using metaphors are not inferior to literal truth, we also must recognize that the indeterminacy of a metaphor means that the truth they communicate has some “ragged edges.”

The Enlightenment’s legacy of privileging literal truth has left its mark on biblical studies as well, as it has meant that the goal of finding the “meaning” of a text is to find that to which the text is ultimately referring. In other words, the goal of much of biblical studies is to dispense with the “ragged edges” of the metaphors and symbols in Scripture by finding their underlying “literal” meaning. Of this phenomenon, McFague notes, “[A]fraid that our images refer to nothing, we literalize them, worshiping the icon in our desperation.”¹⁹¹ However, there is no need to sacrifice the verity of biblical metaphor while seeking to appreciate its rich and multivalent possibilities for meaning; we need not literalize biblical metaphor in order to make it say something “true;” it is already true.

Soskice observes that the sciences often rely on models for their explanatory power, and these models aid in forming and testing new hypotheses.¹⁹² For some who see metaphors and models as merely heuristic devices there is a temptation to conclude that these models are only “useful in limited ways as temporary psychological aids . . . but finally [are] dispensable.”¹⁹³ However, Max Wartofsky, a philosopher of science, argues that a scientific model would not be useful “if there were not some sense in which the model mirrored some aspect of what it is taken to be a model of.”¹⁹⁴ Alex Burri goes even further and claims, “Denn ohne Metaphorik wäre die Wissenschaft nicht *unsere* Wissenschaft,”¹⁹⁵ since scientific models are a necessary and integral component of scientific inquiry and explanation. In the same way then, literary metaphors rely on models, and these models create new connections and knowledge for their hearers/readers, knowledge that is only accessible through these particular metaphors. Therefore, this study does not view truth communicated through metaphor as if it were of a lower order than “literal” truth, nor will I attempt to

191 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 10.

192 See the chapter “Model and Metaphor in Science and Religion,” in *Metaphor and Religious Language*.

193 Ibid., 133. N.b., This is not McFague’s view.

194 Marx Wartofsky, *Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding* (Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 48, London: Reidel, 1979), 38–39.

195 Alex Burri, “Metaphern, Modelle und wissenschaftliche Erklärungen,” in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 289 (emph. orig.).

identify the “literal truth” communicated through biblical metaphor. Rather, this study proceeds with the assumption that the biblical authors, in this case Paul, used metaphor to communicate something true to their hearers/readers about who God is and who they were in relation to God.

The Function of Metaphor in Theology

Having said that biblical metaphors are neither reducible to literal paraphrases nor merely useful heuristic devices, it is helpful here to include a few positive remarks about the function and purpose of biblical and theological metaphors. Soskice insightfully remarks, “There are many areas where, if we do not speak figuratively, we can say very little.”¹⁹⁶ Thus biblical and theological metaphor is not only a heuristic device, but is indispensable for descriptions of a transcendent God and of the human-divine relationship.¹⁹⁷ As McFague asserts, “Models are necessary, then, for they give us something to think about when we do not know what to think, a way of talking when we do not know how to talk.”¹⁹⁸ Furthermore, the biblical authors who employed these metaphors believed them to present an accurate, albeit incomplete picture of God (thus the plurality of metaphors). The biblical authors employ metaphors, and they expect their audiences to respond to metaphors, not because they are attempting to persuade their audiences through elegant or sophisticated modes of expression, but because they believe that their metaphors accurately depict transcendent states and relations.¹⁹⁹ In light of the connection between metaphor and transcendent reality, this study proceeds under the assumption that biblical metaphors are foundational, non-paraphrasable, and indispensable for the task of communicating transcendent truths that are accessible only through each specific metaphor.²⁰⁰

Since this study operates with a strong view of metaphor, namely, that metaphors “function in the task of saying that which cannot be said in other ways,”²⁰¹ and since it also assumes that metaphors and their underlying

196 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 96.

197 For a similar discussion on the use of metaphor and model in science and philosophy see Lutz Danneberg, Andreas Graeser, and Klaus Petrus, “Metapher und Innovation,” in *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel (Bern: Haupt, 1995), 9–21.

198 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 24.

199 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 112.

200 See Erin M. Heim, “Paths Beyond Tracing Out: The Hermeneutics of Metaphor and Theological Method,” in *The Voice of God in the Text of Scripture*, eds. Oliver D. Crisp, and Fred Sanders (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 112–126.

201 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 63.

models do provide epistemic access to transcendent truths, the final element that requires explanation is how these two elements work together in the interpretive process. In speaking of language acquisition, David Rumelhart observes that in describing a new situation, a young child “must proceed through a process of fitting the aspects of the . . . situation into the closest lexical concept already available.”²⁰² Likewise in theological metaphor, biblical authors used what they viewed as the closest finite model or state of affairs in order to speak of transcendent things. In light of this, the task of the exegete is not to find a metaphor’s univocal meaning, but to allow the multivalent associations epistemically accessible through biblical metaphors to shape and structure her perception of the transcendent. Furthermore, rather than attempting to smooth the ragged edges of a metaphor’s possible meanings, an interpreter must appreciate that the epistemic access that a metaphor provides can function as an entry point for discovering other possible meanings as the interpreter traces the implications of a metaphor’s underlying model.²⁰³ Therefore, this study operates under the premise that biblical metaphors, and the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors in particular, function to provide a unique set of associations that are only epistemically accessible through each individual metaphor, and that no biblical metaphor should be thought of as metaphor “for” something else (i.e., adoption is not a metaphor “for” salvation). If we begin with the premise that biblical metaphors are non-paraphrasable, unique, and multivalent in their meaning, then the exegetical task is to embrace the metaphor’s ragged edges, to plumb the depths of its meaning, and thereby create a robust account of its theological significance.

Conclusion

This chapter began by proposing a working theory of metaphor that was both philosophically defensible and also useful for the exegetical task of interpreting biblical metaphor. While there are many definitions available, and while there is still considerable debate among philosophers of language about the nature and function of metaphor, this study relies on Soskice’s definition of metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”²⁰⁴ This definition restricts

202 David Rumelhart, “Some Problems with the Notion of Literal Meanings,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 73.

203 Dawes, *The Body In Question*, 39.

204 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

metaphor to a literary phenomenon, thus enabling an interpreter to identify metaphors in the text with a high level of precision, and also to distinguish between a metaphor and the mental states and simulations it evokes in readers/hearers. Furthermore, I argued that each metaphor has both a tenor (the primary subject of the metaphor) and a vehicle (the term(s) by which the tenor is described), and that these two parts interanimate in order to produce the metaphor's "two ideas for one." Though a metaphor is, strictly speaking, a literary phenomenon, metaphors all rely on their hearers/readers conjuring an underlying model through which the metaphor's multivalent associations are structured, simulated, and filtered within their minds. These models draw upon the conventional meaning of words, as metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance rather than individual lexemes, which cannot be said to have "metaphorical meaning." Thus metaphors lead to an "intercourse of thoughts," which has the capacity to shape the perceptions and emotions of their hearers; these features of metaphor will be addressed in the following chapter.

The second part of the chapter sought to deal with several areas of special concern arising from applying Soskice's theory of metaphor to the exegesis of biblical texts. Of particular note for exegesis are the ramifications of treating metaphor as a literary phenomenon that include: the relationship between metaphorical meaning and context, and the indeterminate nature of metaphorical meaning. Of the former, I concluded that since the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and each metaphorical utterance in the biblical text creates a unique meaning through the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle, it is incorrect to assume that a metaphor's meaning holds steady in all contexts. Thus the latter half of this study will treat each occurrence of a Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphor separately, without attempting to reach a synthesized "meaning" of *υιοθεσία* in Paul's thought. Moreover, further complicating the interpretive task, I argued that metaphors by nature yield some degree of indeterminacy in their meaning because it is impossible to say precisely which associations of a model will transfer for a particular reader/hearer during a particular reading/hearing. However, I also argued that this indeterminacy should not lead us to despair of finding meaning in biblical metaphors, but rather that their "ragged edges" should be embraced and a diversity of their implications explored. Indeed, far from being dispensable heuristic devices, I argued that biblical metaphors aim to provide epistemic access to truths only available through the set of associations they evoke. As Soskice remarks, "The very frames within which we work are given by metaphors which function in structuring not only what sort of answers we get,

but what kind of questions we ask.”²⁰⁵ Therefore, if we are to appreciate the Pauline *υἱοθεσία* metaphors for their unique perspective on the transcendent, we need to resist the temptation to equate them with other Pauline metaphors, to literalize them into a theological definition or to propose for them a univocal meaning. Instead we must allow the metaphors to structure our questions and categories with the associations and implications they conjure in each of their various manifestations.

205 Ibid., 90.

Metaphor: Perception, Emotion, Intimacy, and Identity Formation

Introduction

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, the theoretical approach taken by philosophers of language is not the only way of analyzing metaphor. Researchers in cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, and contemporary rhetoric and communication often take a more practical approach to the study of metaphor, and there has been a considerable amount of research devoted to analyzing metaphor in terms of its potential for persuasion and influence over its readers/hearers. It has been uncommon up until now to combine aspects of cognitive theories with philosophical theories within a single study, however I contend that these seemingly disparate approaches each can contribute tools to biblical exegesis that complement rather than exclude other approaches.

A philosophical approach to metaphor primarily seeks to understand *what metaphor is*, and, as seen in the previous chapter, this philosophical analysis is further enriched by research in cognitive linguistics that shows how our minds make meaning of language. In this chapter we will shift our focus to the practical question: “*What does metaphor do?*”—a question that is equally important for approaching and analyzing metaphor in biblical exegesis. Metaphors have long been recognized as performative utterances in which “to say something is to *do* something,”¹ or put differently, a metaphor actively creates and constructs a particular perception of its subject for its intended audience.² Gaventa observes that a metaphor

provokes reflection and even insight. Metaphors ask us to change our minds. . . . If a metaphor does work its way with us, however, it forces us to consider things differently. It alters our perspective.³

¹ J. L. Austin, *How to Do Things With Words* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 12.

² Following Austin, Röska-Hardy argues, “Die Wirkungen, die wir dem Phänomen der Metapher zuschreiben, sind demnach die perlokutionären Folgen einer vom Sprecher/Autor absichtlich ausgeführten Sprachhandlung, welche bei der Interpretation der Sprachhandlung durch den Hörer/Leser entstehen” (“Metapher, Bedeutung und Verstehen,” 139).

³ Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 10.

In order to provide a fuller picture of what metaphors are and how they work, this chapter discusses the performative features of metaphor in terms of their cognitive and affective capacities. This chapter examines the capacity of metaphors (1) to structure thought and influence the perceptions of individuals, (2) to evoke emotions and to cultivate intimacy between people, and (3) to create and foster a unique identity and ethos when used in the context of a particular community. The task in this chapter is to illustrate how metaphor works in these capacities, and to do so I will consider both extra-biblical and biblical examples of metaphors functioning to influence perception, emotion, intimacy, and identity, which will be defined below. These examples are intended to illuminate the methodology and show its relevance for the analysis of the biblical text. Thus when biblical examples are used they are not intended to be taken as a detailed or complete exegesis, but rather they were chosen to illustrate a particular facet of the methodology that will be applied in much greater detail in my exegesis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the second part of this study.

Before moving to the analysis of these three areas, a few further preliminary remarks regarding two key presuppositions in other studies on the *υιοθεσία* metaphors should be made. First, previous studies on the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors have tended to operate under the assumption that metaphors are neutral conduits of information rather than productive and performative utterances.⁴ However, this chapter will show that a metaphor is not a passive description of a subject, but rather it is an active agent that *does something* (e.g., alters perceptions, structures thoughts, influences attitudes). A metaphor's ability to shape and influence perception has been widely documented and discussed in the field of rhetoric and communication, and thus there is ample support for treating biblical metaphor as an active agent with persuasive capacity. As performative utterances, metaphors actively create particular perceptions, filter out other ways of thinking, and exert powerful influence over attitudes and values.⁵ Therefore, it is not enough for exegesis to focus on the background of a metaphor,⁶ it also must attempt to delineate the cognitive structures and mental simulations a metaphor effects and the feelings it evokes for a particular experience (or set of experiences) for the audience, which will be discussed in greater detail below.

4 This presupposition is especially evident in studies that focus primarily on a metaphor's background; e.g., Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; Allen Mawhinney, "Huiothesia in the Pauline Epistles: Its Background, Use, and Implications," Ph.D. Diss., Baylor University, 1982.

5 Frederick Ferré, "Metaphors, Models, and Religion," *Soundings* 51.3 (1968): 331.

6 The question of background and model will be treated in detail in chapter 4.

A metaphor's performative nature is perhaps then particularly evident and relevant in cases of biblical usage, as the authors of the New Testament are often strategically using metaphor to provide structure and meaning to particular religious experiences and to form the collective identity of new Christian communities. Lakoff and Johnson note,

Metaphors have the power to create a new reality. This can begin to happen when we start to comprehend our experience in terms of a metaphor, and it becomes a deeper reality when we begin to act in terms of it. . . . Much of cultural change arises from the introduction of new metaphorical concepts and the loss of old ones.⁷

Perhaps this is precisely the kind of cultural change Paul was aiming to effect when he used a body metaphor to describe the Christian community in Corinth (1 Cor 12:12–31) and in Rome (Rom 12:4–8), thereby creating a feeling of interdependence between community members. Or in describing the Corinthian church members as vessels of clay containing treasure, Paul is potentially providing a distinctive framework, a distinctive way of thinking about or seeing the world,⁸ through which to process the existential experience of Christians living according to the new knowledge of the gospel (2 Cor 4:6–7). If metaphors have the ability to shape and structure one's perception of reality, then biblical exegesis must seek to determine what kind of framework and perception a particular metaphor and its implications creates, and how it exerts such influence over the perception of its audience.

Second, it is not enough to treat only the cognitive potential of a biblical metaphor; an interpreter should also pay heed to a metaphor's affective nature. Studies from the field of sociolinguistics have demonstrated that the use of figurative language increases feelings of intimacy between an author and audience. Since this feature of figurative language is purely affective,⁹ in some respects it is very difficult to quantify. However, there is ample evidence to support the existence of this feature of metaphor, and thus biblical scholars

⁷ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 145.

⁸ Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 32–33.

⁹ This is not to say that the affective and the cognitive are not related, but rather that studies have shown that the affective potential of the metaphor is evident to an outside observer even if he or she fails to understand the metaphor's meaning or reference; see also William Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," *Memory & Cognition* 35.1 (2007): 90–93.

must consider a metaphor's effect on the evocation of emotion and the creation of intimacy for its intended audience.

Coupled closely with its affective potential is a metaphor's ability to create a certain identity and ethos for group members. Several studies in anthropology and linguistics suggest that symbol and metaphor are among the most powerful tools for shaping, *reshaping*, and structuring the identity and ethos of particular people groups.¹⁰ As McFague remarks, "[R]evolution in language means a revolution in one's world."¹¹ Group members tend to process their thoughts, actions, and relationships using the structure provided by their dominant metaphors,¹² and thus *changes* in group behavior are closely linked with *changes* in their dominant metaphors. Because metaphors are often closely linked with group identity, in undertaking the exegesis of biblical metaphor an interpreter should also consider how particular metaphors may potentially shape and change a community's identity through their use. Therefore when considering the implications of a biblical metaphor, an exegete must ask how a metaphor might shape or reshape the collective identity of its audience. The following sections will address how metaphors achieve their influence on these four areas (perception, emotion, intimacy, and community identity) and further defend their importance for understanding biblical metaphor in general, and the *νιοθεσία* metaphors in particular.

Metaphor and the Individual

Admittedly, it is a bit artificial to separate an analysis of the cognitive and affective potential of a metaphor into those attributes pertaining to the individual and those attributes pertaining to community. Certainly an individual gleans and gathers a good deal of his or her cognitive perception, behavior, and belief through belonging to and participating in a community or communities.¹³ However, the distinction is helpful because it allows for analysis both of how metaphors internally structure thought and influence perception and emotion

10 See also James W. Fernandez, ed., *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991); Carmen Llamas, and Dominic Watt, eds., *Language and Identities* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010).

11 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 9.

12 Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 23–59.

13 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 175–194 for a discussion of the role culture and community plays in language use by individuals.

through embodied simulation, and also how metaphors influence external relationships and identity at a macro level. Therefore I will proceed through an analysis of metaphor and individual perception and emotion with the assumption that these features of metaphor hold influence over individuals who exist *within community*. Changes in perception within the individual can also result in the formation of a new community perception, and frequently a change in a structural metaphor within a particular community results in a change of perception within the individual. Thus, these two areas of analysis are intended to complement each other and the division between “individual” and “community” is largely a pragmatic distinction.

Metaphor and Perception

Metaphor and Cognitive Frameworks

Cognitive theorists have persuasively argued that metaphors are powerful cognitive instruments that shape and structure one's perception of the world.¹⁴ In this sense, metaphors are not mere descriptors of reality. Rather, as performative utterances, metaphors themselves are active agents that create and structure their interpreter's perception of reality, which is largely accomplished through the mental simulations that are evoked by metaphors. According to Richard Lanham this feature is to some degree inherent in all language use, but it is a particularly salient feature of metaphor. Lanham notes, “We perceive the world actively and recreatively; we don't just register a world already ‘out there.’ To perceive the world is also to compose it, to make sense of it.”¹⁵ A metaphor is an author or speaker's “composition” shared with a reader or hearer; it is a figurative device that invites the reader or hearer to “compose” the world in a particular way. A metaphor can function as a central and organizing image for attitudes and perceptions, and thus exerts a deep, yet subtle influence on the perception of its hearer/reader.¹⁶ Part of a metaphor's persuasive influence lies in its ability to structure one's perception of reality through mental simulation, sometimes by means of a single image.¹⁷

14 See especially Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*; Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty*; Gerard Steen, and Raymond Gibbs Jr., eds., *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics* (Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001).

15 Richard Lanham, *Analyzing Prose*, 2nd ed. (London: Continuum, 2003), 3.

16 See also Joel Johnson, and Shelley Taylor, “The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes,” *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 2 (1981): 305.

17 See Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., and Teenie Matlock, “Metaphor, Imagination, and Simulation: Psycholinguistic Evidence,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 161–176.

Indeed, we often do not appreciate how far metaphorical thinking extends, and we often take for granted some of the basic metaphorical structures that ground our understanding of reality. For example, we often speak about the human mind in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a container.¹⁸ Therefore one's mind can be "filled with good ideas," I can "file something away in the back of my mind," or "dust the cobwebs off of an idea," and we can speak of students "cramming for finals," and ignorant people as "airheads." By means of this metaphor, the intercourse of words leads to the intercourse of thoughts,¹⁹ and thus a *literary* metaphor also impacts the *cognitive* framework and mental simulations of a reader/hearer and thereby actively creates or recreates his or her perception of reality. It also follows that a change in the underlying metaphor would result in a different mental simulation, and perhaps would result in a different perception of one's reality.²⁰ For example, if we instead speak of minds in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a field, such as a "fecund brain" or "sowing seeds of doubt" or a "deeply rooted belief," such language produces a different cognitive framework through which to perceive the mind than our original example "THE MIND IS A CONTAINER" creates.

The performative and creative nature of metaphor is also inherent to biblical metaphors, and thus any undertaking of their exegesis should seek to appreciate the ways they are cognitively structuring and restructuring the perceptions of their intended audiences. To take an extended and detailed example that provides a clear cognitive structure we will look at John 10:11–18. In these verses Jesus declares Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός (I am the Good Shepherd), speaking about himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a shepherd.²¹ Drawing

18 See also Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 25–33.

19 Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 94; Turner argues that there are some root metaphors that are so intrinsic to thought that they form the basis to all literary metaphor (*Death is the Mother of Beauty*, 10–12). Pace Lakoff and Johnson, Turner, and other cognitive theorists, Naomi Quinn argues "that metaphors, far from constituting understanding, are ordinarily selected to fit a preexisting and culturally shared model" ("The Cultural Basis of Metaphor," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991], 60).

20 It is worth noting that metaphors such as "THE MIND IS A CONTAINER" are so strongly ingrained that the task of eradicating them would be highly unlikely to succeed (Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 62–65). N.b., Within sources from cognitive linguistics conceptual metaphors occur in small caps to denote that these metaphors do not necessarily appear directly in language, but rather compose the conceptual framework of language; this study will utilize small caps for conceptual metaphors.

21 Recall that this study will rely upon Soskice's definition of metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of

on the same metaphor, Jesus as the Good Shepherd states ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων (The Good Shepherd lays down his life on behalf of his sheep), and also γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμὰ (I know my [sheep] and they know me), and further that his sheep τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούσουσιν (will hear my voice). While some might argue that Jesus' words are merely a description of reality, cognitive theories of metaphor suggest that the declaration Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός (I am the Good Shepherd) actually creates the new cognitive framework "Jesus is the Good Shepherd" through which the reader now processes his actions and ministry. This cognitive framework might entail mental simulations from the perspective of an observer that invoke a detailed scene of a shepherd caring for sheep (and all of the sights, sounds, movements, and smells that entails). Thus when hearers of the Fourth Gospel are confronted with Jesus' crucifixion in John 19, one of the cognitive frameworks in operation is Jesus crucified *as the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep*. In this example, the metaphor's performative nature actively creates a new framework through which to interpret and perceive later events in the narrative, giving these events a particular meaning that they would not acquire via another metaphor. As Victor Turner observes, "the metaphor selects, emphasizes, suppresses, and organizes features of the principal subject,"²² which in this case provides a cognitive framework that endows Jesus' death with a particular theological meaning.

Another short but clear example of a metaphor creating a new cognitive framework for its hearers/readers is Paul's declaration in 2 Timothy 4:6, Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι (I am already being poured out [as a drink offering]).²³ In speaking of his ministry, and presumably his impending martyrdom, in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a drink offering being poured out, Paul creates a cognitive framework through which his audience is meant to understand the suffering he has endured throughout his ministry and ultimately his impending death. Here then is a prime example of what Lakoff and Turner are referring to when they state, "the power of such a metaphor is its ability

another" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15); for a more detailed explanation of this definition see chapter 2.

22 Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*, 30.

23 Note that in Greek there is no simile (as a drink offering) in the text. The whole idea "being poured out as an offering" is contained in the verb σπένδεσθαι. Also, I use "Paul" to designate the author here because the letter has traditionally been attributed to Paul, and the framework the metaphor is intended to create in this text remains the same regardless of one's position on the authorship of the letter.

to *create* structure in our understanding.”²⁴ The cognitive structure created by Paul’s drink offering metaphor brings about the perception that he is facing his martyrdom on his own terms—namely, that he views his suffering and his impending death as something he has undergone willingly in service to God rather than something that has been done *to him* by the Roman authorities. Thus, the metaphor is not merely a description of Paul’s suffering and martyrdom, but rather it actively fills these events in Paul’s life with purpose and significance for his audience. Without the use of the metaphor in 2 Timothy 4:6, Paul’s suffering and martyrdom would not be identifiable as a coherent set of experiences characterized by “drink offering being poured out.” Certainly there are other metaphors and other cognitive frameworks that are used,²⁵ but the audience’s perception of Paul’s suffering and martyrdom created by the utterance Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι (I am already being poured out [as a drink offering]) is unique to this metaphor alone because only this metaphor evokes the particular mental simulation “drink offering being poured out.” This embodied simulation cannot be paraphrased by a literal utterance without detracting from its “meaning” in the brain, nor is it possible to pinpoint the precise model of “drink offering” that each audience member would associate, since this is contingent upon their individual associations and experiences with drink offerings. As in the examples above, the possible mental simulations evoked by the metaphor create a framework that might support a number of possible implications or nuances regarding Paul’s martyrdom. Taking into account the effect metaphors have on perception, my exegetical analysis of the *υἱοθεσία* metaphors will consider what perceptions each metaphor creates in the texts of Romans and Galatians.

Highlighting and Hiding

Because metaphors are not mere descriptors but rather actively create a particular perception for an individual, they also highlight certain features of their subject while hiding others. In his analysis of political metaphor, Peter Zhang notes “Metaphor never simply *reflects* resemblances. Rather, it almost always actively asserts a non-necessary connection and smuggles in some disconnections as part of the deal.”²⁶ A poignant example of this type of highlighting

24 Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 62.

25 Indeed Paul uses three of them in short succession immediately following: ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου ἐφύστηκεν. τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγωνίσμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα (The time of my departure is near. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race) (2 Tim 4:6b–7).

26 Peter Zhang, “Corporate Identity Metaphor as Constitutive Discourse in Miniature: The Case of New China Life,” *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 68.4 (2011): 381.

and hiding is the common metaphor “TIME IS A THIEF.”²⁷ When we speak of time “stealing the beauty of youth” or time “robbing us of our joys” we focus on those attributes of time (i.e., that it seems to pass too quickly, or that we cannot change the past) that are highlighted in the cognitive framework produced by the metaphor. Furthermore, when we speak about time in this manner we also tend to *operate* according to the metaphor’s cognitive framework and *act* as if time somehow is wronging us by progressing forward, that it somehow takes something from us without permission. By highlighting time’s tendency to feel as though it is passing too quickly, the “TIME AS THIEF” metaphor obfuscates the constancy and relentlessness of time’s true nature. As Lakoff and Turner aptly remark, “the metaphor of time as thief hides the idea that it is a matter of natural law that everything gets old and dies, and that therefore no one has a right not to.”²⁸ Because of its potential for highlighting certain features and hiding others, metaphor is thus a powerful tool for framing and influencing one’s perception; it creates a cohesive and easily digested package of a particular point of view.²⁹

Though this feature of metaphor is not typically considered in exegesis, biblical metaphor also highlights and hides, subtly (and sometimes overtly) shaping one’s perception of its subject. One of the clearest examples of this is Jesus’ indirect insult to Herod: Πορευθέντες εἰπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ (Go tell that fox) (Luke 13:32). A metaphoric insult almost invariably focuses all of one’s attention on a particular negative characteristic of its subject (in this case Herod’s wiliness) to the exclusion of others, and thus it is a particularly good illustration of a metaphor’s ability to influence one’s impression and opinion. It is further worth mentioning that in this highlighting, the metaphorical reference to Herod as a fox actually *creates* a particular perception of Herod for the readers/hearers that hides or excludes all other facets of Herod’s personhood from consideration; it does not simply illuminate Herod’s “foxlike” qualities.

Likewise, James 3:6–10 contains an extended example of a metaphor clearly aimed at highlighting particular features while hiding others. In his admonishment to control one’s speech, James first states καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ (and the tongue is a fire) and then later calls the tongue ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου (a restless evil, full of deadly poison). These two metaphors complement each other to create a powerful perception of the tongue as an agent of discord. As cognitive instruments, metaphors construct a vivid mental image

27 Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 39.

28 Ibid.

29 Gerald O’Brien, “Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing of Marginalized Groups: Implications for Social Work Education,” *Journal of Social Work Education* 45.1 (2009): 31.

(and possibly also an experience of the sounds and smells of fire or poison) for the tendency of careless gossip and slander to spiral quickly out of control. The imagery of a fire burning out of control and of poison spreading highlights the severity of their consequences. Indeed, these two metaphors are so persuasive and vivid that it is difficult to think in a different framework about speech and gossip when one is confronted with them.³⁰ However, both metaphors to some degree hide the role of “listening ears” that contribute to the spread of gossip, framing careless speech as an internal and individual problem rather than a problem perhaps stemming from a negative community ethos. Furthermore, when viewing the problem of divisive and damaging speech through these metaphors it is easy to forget the positive role that speech can play in a community. What each of these examples of biblical metaphor shows, then, is that metaphor is not neutral in its cognitive framing, and therefore part of the interpretive process is to consider the ramifications of a metaphor’s cognitive framework. Furthermore, because metaphor is selective and subtle in the way it affects one’s perception, the analysis of the *πίοθησία* metaphors will proceed with a level of awareness of what these metaphors are highlighting and what they are hiding in each of their contexts.

Recognizing that metaphors highlight some features and hide others is essential to understanding the powerful influence metaphors exert over perception. When an interpreter or audience ceases to recognize this, then for such a person it seems as though there are no other metaphors, no other frameworks, and thus no other ways in which people can think.³¹ Moreover, when metaphors go unrecognized their meanings are often collapsed into their underlying models, and inappropriate associations are frequently smuggled into their metaphorical meaning. A prime, yet controversial, example of a metaphor that often goes unrecognized is the designation “Father” for the first person of the Trinity,³² and often the result is that the metaphor creates

30 Cognitive linguists call this difficulty “interference,” and it has been documented in several important studies. See Shane Lindsay, “Visual Priming of Language Comprehension.” M.A. Thesis. University of Sussex, Brighton, UK; M. P. Kaschak, C. J. Madden, D. J. Theriault, R. H. Yaxley, M. E. Aveyard, A. A. Blanchard, and R. A. Zwaan, “Perception of Motion Affects Language Processing,” *Cognition* 94 (2005): B79–B89.

31 Raymond Gibbs Jr., *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 142.

32 The literature on this topic is mammoth, and I recognize that there are many scholars and theologians who assert that the designation “Father” is not metaphorical, but rather is the revealed name of the first person of the Trinity (see esp. Aída Besançon Spencer, “Father-Ruler: The Meaning of the Metaphor ‘Father’ for God in the Bible” [*JETS* 39.3 (1996): 433–42] for an overview of the relevant literature and a critique in the same spirit as the

an inappropriate perception of God for the hearer who fails to recognize the relationship between metaphor and model. For example, the well-known and somewhat controversial pastor John Piper asserts,

God has revealed himself to us in the Bible *pervasively* as King, not Queen, and as Father not Mother. The second person of the Trinity is revealed as the eternal Son. The Father and the Son created man and woman in his image, and gave them together the name of the man, *Adam* (Genesis 5:2). God appoints all the priests in Israel to be men. The Son of God comes into the world as a man, not a woman. . . . From all of this, I conclude that God has given Christianity a masculine feel. . . . He has ordained for the church a masculine ministry.³³

While Piper is surely correct in identifying that “Father” is a dominant metaphor, it does not follow that the metaphor “Father” implies the maleness of the first person of the Trinity.³⁴ Although feminine imagery predicated of the first person of the Trinity is less frequent than masculine imagery, the counter examples of feminine imagery and characteristics attributed to God still demonstrate the inappropriateness of Piper’s claim of Christianity being ordained to have an inherently “masculine” feel. Thus it is troubling that in identifying the first person of the Trinity, the Father, as inherently masculine rather than feminine, which evidences the collapse of the metaphor into its underlying model, Piper filters out all of the maternal and feminine imagery predicated of God in Scripture (e.g., Deut 32:13, 18; Ps 22:9–11; Isa 45:9–12; Hos 11:1–4). In contrast, Sallie McFague argues that “while God is imagined in masculine as well as in feminine metaphors, the divine is neither male nor female but

brief critique I present here). In addition, biblical names are frequently both nominal and metaphorical (e.g., *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος*/you are Peter), and thus there is nothing inherently contradictory about “Father” being both a revealed name and a metaphor. Moreover, if one were to make an argument for the revealed name of God from Scripture, then surely just as strong of a case could be made for יהוה (YHWH) being the revealed, non-metaphorical name of God. I am also not suggesting that the designation “Father” is dispensable, or that it does not truly refer to God’s being, but rather I am pointing out that as a metaphor, there are some parts of the underlying model “Father” (e.g., maleness to the exclusion of femaleness, or anatomical begetting) which do not transfer.

33 John Piper, “The Frank and Manly Mr. Ryle’: The Value of a Masculine Ministry,” *JBMW* 17.1 (2012): 10.

34 This is by no means a new assertion; indeed Gregory of Nyssa remarks that the distinction between male and female “has no reference to the Divine Archetype” (*On the Making of Man* 16.14 [NPNF 5:406]).

embraces and transcends both.”³⁵ The point here is not about tallying up the masculine and feminine images to see which gender is a truer reflection of the first person of the Trinity. Rather, what Piper’s statement shows is the power of metaphor to implement a particular cognitive framework such that it becomes seen as *the single correct way* to view a particular subject, and such that the distinction between a metaphor and its underlying model is lost.³⁶

As seen in the examples above, one of the dangers of metaphors is that they tend to hide other ways of thinking from view, particularly if they are well worn and culturally dominant.³⁷ As O’Brien observes, “[A]fter a particular conceptual metaphor is widely embraced as an apt way of viewing the target, it may be extremely difficult to replace it with a contrasting mode of framing the issue.”³⁸ In Piper’s statement, his acceptance of the masculine metaphor to the exclusion of all others makes a rather glaring omission for orthodox theology; it hides the third person of the Trinity—the Holy Spirit—completely from view. This is an especially troubling result of the acceptance of Christianity’s “inherently masculine feel” since it would be rather difficult for Piper to give an account of the “masculine” gender of the Holy Spirit, just as it is without foundation to argue for the “feminine” gender of the Holy Spirit, who nevertheless is most often described using feminine and neuter terms (i.e., *רוח*, *πνεῦμα*).³⁹

What Piper’s statement demonstrates is that when an interpreter ceases to recognize that a particular metaphorical framework is at play (in this case “God is Father”) it is often difficult for him or her to avoid ascribing all of its entailments to its subject—even the ones that are inappropriate (i.e., God being male in gender). In light of the evidence above, I would suggest that Piper’s statement about Christianity reveals *his* misunderstanding of the nature of metaphors far more than it gives credence to the notion that orthodox Christianity is “inherently masculine.” As Kenneth Burke notes, “*Many of the ‘observations’ [e.g., since God is Father then Christianity must be masculine] are but implications of the particular terminology in terms of which the*

35 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 168.

36 In light of the tendency to view “Father” as a more “literal” designation than “mother” McFague has argued, “[T]he model of ‘God the father’ has become an idol. When a model becomes an idol, the hypothetical character of the model is forgotten and what ought to be seen as *one* way to understand our relationship with God has become identified as *the way*” (ibid., 9 [emph. orig.]).

37 See the discussion below for more on metaphor and cultural identity.

38 O’Brien, “Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing,” 32.

39 For a good analysis of the difficulties caused by ascribing gender to the Holy Spirit see Paul K. Jewett, “The Holy Spirit as Female?” *Reformed Journal* 28.4 (1978): 10–12.

observations are made."⁴⁰ In Piper's case his "observations" regarding his collection of masculine metaphors and male figures in Scripture lead him to the conclusion that Christianity is inherently more masculine than feminine. Piper's assertion in this case is thus the necessary consequence of his acceptance of masculine language and imagery as *the framework* rather than *a framework* through which God is revealed. I mention this here because like the masculine metaphor "Father, (ὁ πατήρ)" "adoption to sonship (υἱοθεσία)" has the potential to reinforce the "masculine feel" of the biblical text. This need not be the case if we understand that all of the entailments of a metaphor's underlying model do not necessarily transfer, and if we consider that this metaphor is not intending to make a statement about the superior ontological status of one gender over the other, but rather is borrowing an image from the surrounding culture to structure the shape and perception of what it means for a believer to be ἐν Χριστῷ (in Christ).⁴¹ Piper's statement demonstrates precisely why it is important to consider what features are being highlighted and hidden by biblical metaphors so as to not fall prey to the belief that they are the *only way of thinking about a particular topic*.

Metaphor and Emotion

If metaphor theory in general has been moderately neglected by biblical scholars, then it is fair to say that research from other fields on the effects of metaphor on an individual's emotions has been left nearly untouched.⁴² To be fair, research documenting the affective and emotive potential of metaphorical language is far scarcer than research on its cognitive effects. Since the question of precisely *why* and *how* metaphors affect one's feelings is far more complicated than even questions regarding cognition, Joel Johnson and Shelley Taylor observe that research in sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics has largely ignored "the impact of language in general, and metaphor in particular, upon attitude formation and change."⁴³ However, this is beginning to change, and William Horton notes that "the current findings suggest quite clearly that

40 Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), 46 (emph. orig.).

41 See chapter 1 for a more thorough treatment of translation and gender-inclusive language.

42 Gaventa mentions it briefly in her introduction (*Our Mother Saint Paul*, ix–xi); and Howe has a more sustained interaction with metaphor and beliefs (*Because You Bear This Name*, 92–94; 185–232).

43 Johnson and Taylor, "The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes," 305.

people are able to generate assessments about particular uses of language that go far beyond the interpretations of specific words and phrases.”⁴⁴

Further complicating matters is the tendency among biblical scholars to view the text as a conduit or container of “meaning” which needs to be “extracted.”⁴⁵ This metaphorical framework—which largely goes unnoticed—does not lend itself easily to the analysis of the *affective* potential of a text. However, there are equally compelling reasons to see the biblical text as something to be “experienced” as one would a drama or a musical performance,⁴⁶ especially since one of the primary ways that the mind makes meaning is to simulate whatever is being depicted in a text. Perhaps then what biblical scholars sometimes miss when analyzing a text is similar to what musicologists miss when analyzing a musical score. Of this tendency Simon Firth observes, “The emphasis was . . . on the qualities of a [musical] work in space, structural qualities, rather than on the qualities of a work in time, the qualities of immediacy, emotion, sweat.”⁴⁷ Since metaphor as a form of figurative language is by nature artistic, it should not be surprising that like other artistic disciplines, it is also affective and emotive—and these attributes reveal themselves as the story of the text is told *in real time*. As Raymond Collins observes, metaphor “appeals not to the intellect with its ability to calculate advantage and disadvantage for the future but rather to the sensate person, endowed with emotion and with sight, hearing, touch, taste, and smell.”⁴⁸ Following Collins’ sentiment, I propose that metaphors in the biblical text are not only to be analyzed for their cognitive content, but are also to be *experienced* for their emotive and affective potential. Indeed, the success of a metaphor is often dependent on a reader, or

44 Horton, “Metaphor and Readers’ Attributions of Intimacy,” 93.

45 The “text as conduit” metaphor is thus a prime example of how a metaphor’s framework determines the “appropriate” course of action—in this case, analytic exegesis. For further explanation see Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 126–38; for a sustained critique of the conduit metaphor in language see Michael J. Reddy, “The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language,” in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 164–201.

46 For example: (1) the orality and collectivity of the cultures that produced the text, (2) the public and liturgical nature of its history, and so on. Studies that focus on the narrative quality of the biblical text also tend to presuppose the text as drama; e.g., Richard Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology* (Louisville: WJK, 2005).

47 Simon Firth, “Music and Identity” in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds. S. Hall and P. du Gay (London: Sage, 1996), 116.

48 Raymond Collins, *The Power of Images in Paul* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008), 7.

a community of readers, being persuaded to *feel* a certain way about a subject, and not solely on its ability to communicate cognitive content.⁴⁹ Though the experiential aspects of metaphor are perhaps more difficult to describe and quantify than its cognitive content, they are certainly no less significant.

The emotional thrust of a metaphor begins with the speaker's selection of a particular metaphorical utterance, which may be motivated by a speaker's *feelings* just as much as by his or her *thoughts*. Within any given context, a metaphor often does more than simply conveying a specific meaning; a metaphor also provides a window into how speakers or authors feel about their subject and their audience.⁵⁰ When an audience receives a speaker's metaphor, the audience is not only asked to join in the speaker's vision that is created by the metaphor, but also to empathize with the speaker's feelings associated with the metaphor. Ted Cohen writes,

When your metaphor is 'X is Y', you are hoping that I will see X as you do, namely as Y, and, most likely, although your proximate aim is to get me to see X in this way, your ultimate wish is that I will feel about X as you do.⁵¹

In Cohen's view, the cognitive content of a metaphor is but a bridge to the ultimate goal of fostering shared *feelings* about a particular subject. Wayne Booth comes to a similar conclusion stating, "To *understand* a metaphor is by its very nature to *decide* whether to join the metaphorist or reject him, and that is simultaneously to decide either to be shaped in the shape his metaphor requires or to resist."⁵² Especially in political rhetoric and propaganda, there are numerous examples of metaphors that are chosen specifically for this type of affective potential.⁵³ The most extreme examples include: (1) The depiction of Jews as rats, vermin, devils, or talk of "The Final Solution to the Jewish Question," in Nazi propaganda,⁵⁴ (2) the portrayal of the Tutsi minority

49 That is not to say that there is a clean division between a metaphor's emotive and cognitive content. As Soskice observes, "We cannot conceive of emotive 'import' apart from a cognitive content which elicits it" (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 27).

50 Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 87.

51 Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 23.

52 Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric," 63.

53 For a specific analysis of the persuasive effects of political metaphor see Köller, *Semiotik und Metapher*, 276–90.

54 See also Randall L. Bytwerk, "The Argument for Genocide in Nazi Propaganda," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91.1 (2005): 37–62.

as “cockroaches” in radio broadcasts by the Hutu majority,⁵⁵ (3) numerous media sources in the United States who speak of undocumented workers in terms suggestive of an infectious disease or a pollutant,⁵⁶ and so on. What is significant about these metaphorical portrayals is certainly not their cognitive content, but the visceral reactions they evoke via the mental simulations they undoubtedly conjure. Pests and vermin are meant to be exterminated, diseases are meant to be fought, and thus these metaphors foster powerful feelings of revulsion toward their subjects that have been historically accompanied by the heinous treatment of the people groups they target.⁵⁷ Although Paul’s letters to Rome and Galatia are not necessarily as rhetorically charged as political propaganda, neither are they dry, cerebral pieces of writing. Thus they must be read with attention to their emotive content in addition to their capacity to communicate cognitive content.

Certainly the most significant obstacle to a theory that seeks to integrate the cognitive and affective components of a metaphor is the difficulty in determining and assessing a metaphor’s capacity to influence the thoughts and feelings of its audience. This is particularly true for biblical metaphors, as the audience in question is no longer directly accessible and thus the effects of the metaphor cannot be measured by any kind of quantitative study.⁵⁸ Moreover, there is no firm consensus on how to speak about, assess, or quantify “emotion,” which further complicates the exegetical task. Although theories of emotion from the areas of psychology, philosophy, and anthropology abound,⁵⁹ this study will

55 See also Bill Berkely, “Sounds of Violence: Rwanda’s Killer Radio,” *New Republic* 211 (1994): 18–19.

56 J. David Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of ‘Immigrant as Pollutant’ in Media Representations of Immigration,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11.4 (2008): 569–601.

57 The persuasive ability of these metaphors is what led Booth to undertake an in-depth analysis of the ethics of metaphor (*The Company We Keep*, 293–373).

58 Studies on the affective capacity of metaphors have been carried out in recent years by several scholars, e.g., Pradeep Sopory, “Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Structural Coherence,” *Communication Studies* 59.2 (2008): 164–81; Raymond Gibbs Jr., “Metaphor Interpretation as Embodied Simulation,” *Mind & Language* 21.3 (2006): 434–58; David S. Miall, and Don Kuiken, “A Feeling for Fiction: Becoming What We Behold,” *Poetics* 30 (2002): 221–41.

59 See esp. S. Schachter, and J. Singer, “Cognitive Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional States,” *Psychological Review* 69 (1962): 379–99; Anna Wierzebecka, “Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: A Semantic Perspective,” in *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion*, eds. James Russell (et al.), (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995), 17–45; Andrew Ortony, Gerald Clore, and Alan Collins, *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

utilize a theory of emotion put forth by Zoltán Kövecses, who argues that emotional meaning is both body-based (i.e., “anger” is a physiological response) and socially constructed (i.e., “anger” as a concept has a particular social, ideological, and pragmatic function within a particular culture).⁶⁰ Furthermore, Kövecses argues that when analyzing language in general, and metaphor in particular, a more pertinent question to consider is how emotion is conceptualized in language, and whether “metaphors simply reflect a preexisting, literal reality” or if they “actually create or constitute our emotional reality?”⁶¹ Kövecses asserts that emotions are conceptualized through a variety of structural metaphors such as: EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES INSIDE A PERSON/CONTAINER, ATTRIBUTES ARE POSSESSED OBJECTS, EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS, EMOTION IS FORCE, EMOTION IS PHYSICAL AGITATION, AN EMOTIONAL RELATIONSHIP IS A DISTANCE BETWEEN TWO ENTITIES, and IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL.⁶² Moreover, Kövecses demonstrates a high degree of universality for these structural metaphors, and indeed many are identifiable in expressions of emotion in the biblical text. For example, Paul’s assertion that the Corinthians have become “puffed up” (ὕμᾱς ἐφουσιώθησαν τινες) utilizes the conceptual metaphor EMOTIONS ARE SUBSTANCES INSIDE A PERSON/CONTAINER to communicate that pride causes the container (person) to swell (1 Cor 4:18). Jesus’ emotion upon encountering the grief for Lazarus is depicted as physical agitation (EMOTION IS PHYSICAL AGITATION), where the text records he was “deeply moved (ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν)” (John 11:33). As I will demonstrate, these conceptual metaphors for emotion are also identifiable in the Pauline texts containing the *υἰοθεσία* metaphors, and thus provide a mode of inquiry for identifying how the emotional content of these passages might have been conceptualized for Paul’s audience. Thus, in each exegetical chapter the conceptual metaphors of emotion will be identified in the text surrounding the *υἰοθεσία* metaphors, and then I will propose possible conceptual links between the emotional content and the cognitive content communicated by the passages in which the *υἰοθεσία* metaphors occur.

However, it is not enough to simply identify Paul’s use of emotive language or conceptual metaphors of emotion. One is still left to consider how Paul’s

60 Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 1–19; 114–138; 182–200; see also the helpful summary of this research in Zoltán Kövecses, “Metaphor and Emotion,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 380–396.

61 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 1.

62 Ibid., passim.

use of the *νόθεσσία* metaphors elicits an emotional response from his audience members. Once again, measuring the response of the audience is unavailable, although contemporary scholars have begun to investigate the effects of textual metaphors on the emotions and moods of the reader and have discovered a substantial connection between metaphor and the evocation of emotion.⁶³ Research in this area has uncovered a strong link between metaphor and a sense of personal participation or identification with the narrative and characters in the text,⁶⁴ which some cognitive linguists attribute to the brain's simulation of the events described in a narrative.⁶⁵ From a theoretical perspective, Booth argues that metaphors impose narratives and imply a story, which in turn invite the hearers/readers to participate in that story with all of the attendant emotions that accompany it.⁶⁶ Booth further claims that a metaphor's narrative "invites us to come and live within a given culture, sharing the assumptions of all who live there. Our entire way of life is thus at stake."⁶⁷ Thus according to Booth's theory, when confronted with a *νόθεσσία* metaphor, Paul's audience enters into the narrative imposed by the metaphor and experiences its attendant emotions, clues of which are present in the conceptual metaphors of emotion that are latent in the literary context. Therefore, any analysis of the affective content of the metaphor also needs to concern itself with the larger narrative the metaphor, and its accompanying conceptual metaphors of emotion, that is extended as an invitation to the audience.

The insights of Kövecses and Booth are most easily illustrated through several brief examples from the biblical text. A prime example of an extended biblical metaphor that is aimed specifically at cultivating a shared perspective and emotional response is the story (or parable) that Nathan tells David in 2 Samuel 12:1–6 to call him to account for his treatment of Uriah.⁶⁸ In the story,

63 E.g., Miall and Kuiken, "A Feeling for Fiction," 221–241; Trent S. Parker, and Karen S. Wampler, "Changing Emotion: The Use of Therapeutic Storytelling," *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 32.2 (2006): 155–166.

64 See e.g., Miall and Kuiken, "A Feeling for Fiction," 238–239; Don Kuiken (et al.), "Locating Self-Modifying Feelings within Literary Readings," *Discourse Processes* 38.2 (2004): 267–86; Sopory, "Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Coherence," 175–178.

65 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 93–119.

66 Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 169–196; 293–320.

67 *Ibid.*, 335.

68 A parable meets our definition of a metaphor because it is an extended example of speaking of one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another: e.g., speaking about the kingdom in terms which are seen to be suggestive of sowing seeds (Matt 13:24–30), a mustard seed (Matt 13:31–32), a treasure hidden in a field (13:44–50), etc.; see also Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 19–27.

Nathan tells David of a rich man who, though he had great wealth and many sheep, took the single ewe lamb of his poor neighbor. Moreover, the poor man's ewe lamb would "lie in his bosom" and "was like a daughter to him" (2 Sam 12:3). Under Kövecses' description of conceptual metaphor this detail of the text communicates the preciousness of the ewe lamb by invoking the metaphor EMOTIONAL CLOSENESS IS PHYSICAL CLOSENESS, which heightens David's sense of indignation at the poor man's separation from the ewe lamb. Also interesting and significant for us here is that the text pointedly remarks on David's emotional state upon hearing the story: "David's anger was greatly kindled against the man" (2 Sam 12:5). In this description we see the emotion anger conceptualized in the metaphor ANGER IS HEAT/FIRE, a conceptual metaphor that has a high degree of universality across cultures and likely communicates not only an emotional, but also a physical and bodily response.⁶⁹ Moreover, the text's mention of this emotion confirms Booth's theory, meaning that David's emotional response indicates that David had accepted the implicit invitation to participate in the narrative and enter into the world created by the text, and significantly, the grammar and syntax of the story (told as third-person using completed action verbs) causes him to adopt the perspective as an observer of the man's situation (which is really his own situation).⁷⁰ Indeed, Nathan's reaction to David confirms Booth's hypothesis as well. Once Nathan had garnered the affective response he needed from David, which David arrives at because he has adopted the perspective of an outside observer, Samuel was able to exclaim, "You are the man!" and redirect David's appropriate feelings of anger toward David's own misdeeds (2 Samuel 12:7). In this case, the metaphorical story is effective because its narrative creates David's feelings of indignation at the actions of "the rich man," and it is the reality of David's emotional response that ultimately moves him to his acts of repentance.

The same type of appeal to empathy and affective response is seen in many of Jesus' parables. The Lucan parable of the Good Samaritan is effective because it seeks to illuminate the issue of neighborliness by asking its hearers to empathize, that is "to feel along with," "a certain person" (ἄνθρωπός τις);⁷¹ it nudges the reader to think "imagine if I were. . ." After recording the distant emotional responses from the priest and the Levite (Luke 10:31–32), responses

69 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 170.

70 Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 108–119.

71 Joel Green remarks, "The choice of opening, 'a certain man,' constitutes a powerful rhetorical move on Jesus' part . . . Stripped of his clothes and left half-dead, the man's anonymity throughout the story is insured; he is simply a human being, a neighbor, in need" (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 429).

that perhaps invoke a conceptual metaphor such as PHYSICAL DISTANCE IS EMOTIONAL DISTANCE, the text records that the Samaritan was “moved with pity (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη),” which illustrates Kövecses’ assertion that emotions are conceptualized as physical forces, and that important or significant things are center.⁷² Moreover, in the narrative the Samaritan’s emotional response functions as the impetus that drives him to action, suggesting that the conceptual framework of emotion as a physical force often results in spurring the experience of that emotion to some sort of outward action.⁷³ The parable ends with Jesus asking the question τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς ληστές; (which of these three *seems to you* to be a neighbor of the man who fell among the robbers?) (Luke 10:36). In using δοκεῖν, which in the LXX and in several uses in the New Testament “emphasises the subjective character of a statement” (e.g., Gen 19:14; 38:15; Matt 17:25; Luke 1:3),⁷⁴ Jesus is asking the lawyer (ὁ νομικός) to offer his subjective and internal interpretation of the parable, one that relies on his ability to imagine himself in the place of “a certain person” (ἄνθρωπός τις). The question Jesus puts to the man therefore implicitly asks him to imagine himself in the position of the man who has been robbed, to become an active participant in the world created by the narrative. As the man imagines himself in the position of the man who was robbed, he also is invited to experience all of the attendant feelings that accompany someone who has been robbed. Thus, Jesus’ question invites the man to judge his own question καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον; (and who is my neighbor?) (Luke 10:29) through the feelings evoked by Jesus’ parable.⁷⁵

Additional parables that have an implicit appeal to empathy and emotion include the Parable of the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:1–7) the Parable of the Lost Coin (Luke 15:8–10), and the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11–31), which are also rife with emotionally charged language (Συγχαρήτε μοι . . . οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται/rejoice with me . . . in the same way there will be joy in heaven [Luke 15:6–7]; Συγχαρήτέ μοι . . . γίνεται χαρὰ ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ/ Rejoice with me . . . there is joy before the angels of God [Luke 15:9–10], ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη/his father was filled with compassion [Luke 15:20],

72 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 83–85.

73 Ibid., 77–82.

74 TDNT, 2: 233.

75 Interestingly, the mental simulations created by this parable are likely influenced by how predisposed a given person is to listen sympathetically to the teachings of Jesus. Those who listen sympathetically are more likely to adopt a participant perspective, while those who are predisposed to reject the teachings of Jesus are more likely to simulate this parable from the perspective of an observer. See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 109–115.

εὐφρανθῆναι δὲ καὶ χαρῆναι ἔδει/we must celebrate and be glad! [Luke 15:32]), and begin with an explicit invitation for the hearers to imagine themselves as participants in the story (Τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν.../Suppose one of you...) [Luke 15:4]). Thus, as Jesus tells the story (or as a reader reads that Jesus tells the story) the Pharisees, scribes, tax collectors, and sinners (and the readers/hearers of Luke's Gospel) simulate the situations and thereby experience the feelings of the one who finds the sheep, the woman who finds the coin, and probably to some degree the feelings of the prodigal son, his brother, *and* his father. Given the prevalence of the emotionally charged language in these examples, it would seem that one of their primary intentions is to create empathic feelings in their audience; in some sense, to *understand* the meaning of the parables is to *experience* the feelings they are intended to evoke.

Although, for clarity, the examples just examined are parables that make an overt and easily identifiable appeal to their readers/hearers to enter into the world created by the narrative, in the exegetical portion of this study I will show that the same kind of invitation, and a condensed narrative, is present in each occurrence of the Pauline *υἱοθεσία* metaphors. Moreover, Booth argues that "the most powerful effects result when we have expended a great deal of mental energy reconstructing an image from minimal clues."⁷⁶ Thus according to Booth a metaphor's narrative need not be explicitly stated in the text for it to effect an emotional response from the audience. The next section of this chapter will attempt to integrate a metaphor's ability to shape perception and emotion with its ability to cultivate intimacy between an author and audience, and to promote a unique community identity among its participants.

Metaphor and Community

In addition to its ability to shape an individual's perceptions and emotions, metaphor is a powerful device for fostering intimacy between an author and audience and between audience members. As such, metaphors are well suited to creating a particular ethos and identity for a community, especially when they are integrated into a community's distinctive vocabulary. In the sections below I will examine some of the evidence from sociolinguistics and communication research which demonstrates how and why metaphors are effective for cultivating intimacy and constructing identity, and then draw some conclusions on the salience of this research for the interpretation of the *υἱοθεσία* metaphors.

76 Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 298.

Metaphor and the Creation of Intimacy

If a metaphor's primary *modus operandi* within the realms of cognition and emotion is to influence by shaping and reshaping one's perception, then a correlative effect is a shared sense of intimacy between the metaphor-maker and the audience. By "intimacy" I do not necessarily mean collegiality or rapport, but rather that metaphors have the ability to single out those who understand, and thus participate in the metaphor, from those who do not.⁷⁷ In this way, metaphors create bonds between their makers and their understanders. The intimacy a metaphor creates is best thought of as the mutual recognition of a "sameness of vision" between the author and audience or between audience members.⁷⁸ It is as if the author is saying "I know that you know that I know that *we* have a shared understanding of *X*," and in the case of many biblical metaphors, "a shared understanding of ourselves as *X*" or "of God as *X*." This intimacy, this recognition of a sameness of vision, can occur both between author and audience, and it also can be something an author seeks to foster between audience members—both of which are features to consider in the analysis of metaphor in the biblical text.

Intimacy Between Author and Audience

It is worth stating at the outset that communication is by its very nature a joint action undertaken by at least two individuals, both of whom belong to certain social groups and bring certain presuppositions to any communicative act.⁷⁹ As Herbert Clark points out, "People entering a joint activity presuppose a great deal about carrying out that activity."⁸⁰ An "activity" can refer to a conversation between a cashier and a customer, a lesson in a classroom, a conversation at a bus stop, *ad infinitum*.⁸¹ Likewise, the biblical authors made certain assumptions about their intended audiences, their intended audiences also made assumptions about the authors, and thus the composition and reception of Scripture is a joint action under Clark's definition.⁸² Successful communication largely depends on the identification of *common ground* between the

77 Of intimacy, Horton remarks "Individuals who dislike each other strongly could nevertheless be quite well acquainted and therefore still be considered to be in some sense 'intimate'" ("Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 89).

78 Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22.

79 Herbert H. Clark, *Using Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 29–58.

80 *Ibid.*, 44.

81 *Ibid.*, 34.

82 The situation is slightly more complicated in the case of the biblical text because of its history of interpretation. One could say that one builds upon layers of these communicative acts each time the Scripture is read in a new context.

author and audience, which Gibbs defines as “a common stock of experiences, interests, and sensibilities . . . [and] specific information about one another’s knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes.”⁸³ Metaphors, along with many other forms of figurative language, exploit the common ground between an author and an audience, as their meaning is not always recoverable to those lacking the proper background and thus cannot perform the mental simulation required to understand what a speaker is saying.⁸⁴ In this way, metaphors not only allow the speaker to communicate a unique meaning but also solidify the distinction between two audiences: “one in the ‘know’ and one ‘in the dark.’”⁸⁵ It also is worth noting that when speakers use a metaphor they do so with the assumption that those whom they intend to understand will in fact understand what they are communicating.⁸⁶ Therefore, when a speaker uses a metaphor and is successfully understood, two things have happened: (1) the speaker has successfully identified and utilized some shared experience or understanding with the audience, and (2) by understanding the metaphor the audience now has received its communicated message *and also understood the bond with the author on the basis of their common ground*. Conversely, if a hearer fails to understand a metaphor it is because he or she lacks the necessary common ground with the author. Thus, metaphors are excellent tools for establishing what common ground exists between an author and audience, and also for establishing boundaries around a particular community.

Like the hypothetical examples given in Clark’s analysis, an author’s identification and exploitation of common ground is a key component in the successful use of metaphors in the biblical text as well. It is quite clear from their choices of metaphors that the biblical authors presuppose certain shared beliefs, knowledge, and attitudes, and this *common ground* acts as a foundation for their metaphors. The metaphors then further reinforce the content of this common ground, creating a bond of intimacy between the author and the audience based on their mutual recognition of their shared knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and experiences. A good example of the identification and exploitation

83 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 134.

84 See Bergen, *Louder Than Words*, 175–194.

85 Albert N. Katz, “Preface,” in *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005), ix. This solidification of group boundaries is discussed in more detail below.

86 Of course it is also possible that the speaker will be unsuccessful and the readers or hearers will not understand, but the fact remains that speakers assume that they will be understood by their audience.

of common ground through a metaphor occurs in Ephesians 2:14, which reads Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἐχθρὰν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ (For he himself is our peace, he has made the two groups one and destroyed the middle wall of partition, the enmity, in his flesh). In this text, the metaphor “enmity is a dividing wall” relies on and reinforces several key pieces of common ground: (1) the mutual recognition of the previous conflict and separation between the two groups ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐν (he has made the two groups one) (2) a shared understanding of the law and covenants such that they would constitute a “wall” between ἀκροβυστία (uncircumcision) and περιτομή (circumcision) (Eph 2:11–12) and (3) a shared experience of Christ’s peace.⁸⁷ This metaphor casts the shared experience and attitudes of the author and audience into sharp relief (i.e., their mutual commitment to Christ) while also subtly erecting a new “wall” around the community in its purview. Here Paul is successful in creating a bond with his audience to the degree that the audience buys into the imagery he puts forth to interpret their experience with Christ. Thus, this metaphor not only has the potential to change their internal perception of their experience with Christ, but also has the potential to foster a more intimate connection with Paul, who shares in their “sameness of vision.”

When an author uses a metaphor to highlight the common ground shared between members of a particular group, he or she is utilizing a *social function* of figurative language to increase feelings of interpersonal closeness. Gibbs suggests, “Many instances of metaphor function beyond their conventional content to signal intimacy, formality, or hostility or to indicate membership in a particular subgroup.”⁸⁸ Sometimes the targeted subgroup of a metaphor is small and easily identifiable, and sometimes, as in the case of advertising or political campaigns, it is more open-ended. For example, the book title *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches* speaks about motherhood in terms which are seen to be suggestive of a war.⁸⁹ In so doing, this book appeals to a particular community (mothers) which has a certain set of common experiences by virtue of being mothers. There are multitudinous books on parenting that do not have metaphorical titles, but the advantage of using a metaphorical title is that it immediately makes the reader feel as if the author knows

87 This metaphor utilizes many additional less salient pieces of common ground, such as (1) living in the Roman Empire, (2) an understanding of who constituted ethnic Israel, and so on.

88 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 136.

89 Rachel Jankovic, *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2010).

how she is *feeling* rather than merely describing the contents of the book. The metaphor in this title appeals to the “sameness of vision” that all mothers share by virtue of being mothers—namely, that motherhood sometimes feels as if we are all involved in some sort of epic and prolonged battle (though the “enemy” might change from day to day).

Metaphors can also appeal to the common ground of a more exclusive subgroup and utilize terminology that is practically unintelligible to non-group members. For example, the director of a jazz band could tell his lead trumpet player to “spend more time in the woodshed,” which would communicate both propositional and social content. From that metaphor the trumpet player would know that the director (1) wanted her to go home and practice before the next rehearsal and (2) considered her part of the in-group of musicians who understood the metaphor’s reference without further explanation. Furthermore, the band director’s use of figurative language is more likely to motivate the player to practice than the equivalent “you need to go home and practice” because it appeals to the player’s sense of community and belonging within the particular subculture “musicians.” In this way, the metaphor “spending time in the woodshed” both draws upon and reinforces the intimate bond between the director and the trumpet player.

In utilizing and reinforcing common ground, metaphors foster feelings of interpersonal closeness between an author/speaker and audience.⁹⁰ Thus William Horton asserts, “Speakers may produce particular figurative expressions partially in order to emphasize the nature of their relationships with their addressees,”⁹¹ and further, “figurative expressions also enable speakers to achieve other, more socially oriented objectives. . . . An especially important goal that may be fulfilled through the use of nonliteral language is the creation and recognition of interpersonal bonds.”⁹² What Horton’s research demonstrates for biblical exegesis is that there is a need to consider the possible social, and perhaps even ecclesiological implications of a metaphor, as metaphors “may generate inferences about social relationships *alongside* more meaning-driven comprehension processes.”⁹³

90 And in certain cases, between audience members, which will become clear in chapters 5–7.

91 Horton, “Metaphor and Readers’ Attributions of Intimacy,” 93; Horton’s conclusions were reached by conducting three quantitative studies comparing people’s perceptions of intimacy in situations where literal language was used with situations where speakers used figurative language.

92 Ibid., 87.

93 Ibid.

Some of the most fascinating examples of biblical metaphors that have easily identifiable social functions are Paul's use of maternal images in 1 Thessalonians and Galatians. In these letters Paul describes himself in terms of a nurse caring for her children (τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα [1 Thess 2:7]) and as a pregnant woman in labor (ὠδίνω μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν [Gal 4:19]). Though these verses certainly convey theological content, they also assuredly accomplished certain social goals. Though it could be argued that the intimacy achieved through these descriptions is in large part due to the intimate nature of the imagery itself (a mother nursing; a woman laboring), the intimacy created by these metaphors extends far beyond their cognitive content. What creates intimacy in the case of these metaphors is primarily the *vulnerability* Paul displays by describing himself in terms seen to be suggestive of a nursing mother and a woman in labor. Furthermore, by choosing such striking images, Paul is highlighting particular features (common ground) of his previous relationships with the churches at Thessalonica and Galatia, drawing attention to their shared membership in the community of believers by means of the metaphors. Thus, Paul's choice of metaphor not only communicates theological content,⁹⁴ but also serves the social function of strengthening the bond of intimacy between his audience and himself. Gaventa argues, "The paraenetic function of these metaphors [infants, nurses, and fathers] goes hand in hand with their social function. By invoking the language of family, Paul implicitly exhorts believers to continue in those relationships."⁹⁵ Paul makes use of the same type of appeal in the *υἱοθεσία* metaphors in their various contexts, which are both intimate in content and also create intimacy by drawing on the experiences shared between Paul and his audience.

Intimacy Between Audience Members

The metaphors in the New Testament occur in communicative exchanges between an author and a *group of addressees* who together form a community. Thus it is beneficial for us to consider the possibility that metaphors can effect feelings of intimacy *between* members of the communities they address in addition to fostering intimacy between an author and an audience member. In the same way authors can utilize the common ground held between themselves and their audience members to foster feelings of intimacy, they also can employ metaphors that draw attention to common ground that

94 I do not mean to suggest that these metaphors serve *only* a social function, as both have rich theological implications in addition to their social functions. For a good analysis of the theological content see Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 25–27, 34–39.

95 *Ibid.*, 27.

audience members share. To use a metaphorical description, the initial cultivation of intimacy between an author and an audience member grows and branches out to include shared feelings of intimacy between group members as well. For clarity's sake, I will rely on Clark's definition of a community as a group of people with "a shared system of beliefs, practices, nomenclature, convictions, values, skills . . . that members of the community assume they can take for granted in other members."⁹⁶ As mentioned above in the discussion on common ground, members of a community share "inside knowledge," and sometimes the knowledge or shared experience is *ineffable* to outsiders. Clark concludes that among these ineffable experiences "we might include such experiences as how a woman feels in a male society (and vice versa), how a member of a minority group feels, and how it feels to be a born-again Christian. These experiences are the ultimate inside information."⁹⁷ When an author uses a metaphor to describe this type of "insider" experience, the performative nature of the metaphor is simultaneously shaping the members' perception of its subject and also drawing attention to the shared "sameness of vision" between community members, inviting them to recognize their common bond. We will see how each of these elements is achieved in several examples below.

Communities quite often have a set of idiosyncratic expressions, metaphors, jokes, proverbs, and so on as part of their community vocabulary.⁹⁸ Figurative language, and metaphor in particular, can often function as a kind of shorthand when it is used between members of a particular community.⁹⁹ For example, describing the book of Galatians as "a theological minefield," as one of my colleagues once did to a group of students, is an abbreviated way of implying that there are quite a few interpretive issues to navigate and touchy theological debates to consider when working through a translation. It also suggested to the students that they should work carefully through their translations so as to avoid setting off one of these theological "mines." This metaphor "worked" on several levels: (1) it communicated a message to the students about the content of Galatians, (2) it utilized and reinforced the common ground between the students and the speaker as exegetes of the New Testament and (3) it increased

96 Clark, *Using Language*, 102.

97 Ibid., 110.

98 See also David L. Ritchie, and Char Schell, "'The Ivory Tower' on an 'Unstable Foundation': Playful Language, Humor, and Metaphor in the Negotiation of Scientists' Identities," *Metaphor and Symbol* 24.2 (2009): 90–104.

99 Sam Glucksberg, and Boaz Keysar, "How Metaphors Work," in *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 422.

the feelings of camaraderie between the class members as they “soldiered on” together through their translations. By highlighting their common experience and group membership, the metaphor my colleague used helped the students recognize, among other things, that they were all in it together.

The New Testament authors are equally shrewd in choosing their metaphors to highlight the common ground their audience members share with one another. Vivid examples of this are the metaphorical references to “circumcision of the heart” or “spiritual circumcision” as a contrast to physical circumcision (Rom 2:25–29; Col 2:11–15, cf. Gal 5:2–3; 6:13–15; Eph 2:11; Phil 3:2–3). Frequently this metaphorical reference is applied with inclusive plural pronouns (e.g., ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή/we are the circumcision [Phil 3:3]), which increases the likelihood of it fostering a sense of intimacy and shared experience between community members.¹⁰⁰ Since “spiritual circumcision” (ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομή ἀχειροποιήτῳ/in whom you were circumcised with a circumcision not made by human hands [Col 2:11]) is by definition one that cannot be seen outwardly (ἡ ἐν τῷ φανεφῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή [Rom 2:28]), and since it is also clear that Paul sees it as a mark of membership in the Christian community, the metaphorical description “circumcision” becomes a tool for highlighting a powerful shared experience for the community members. By using the metaphor to highlight this shared experience among community members Paul is able to increase their interpersonal bonds and also presumably minimize their areas of difference or conflict.¹⁰¹ Though they are most often analyzed for their theological content, the “soteriological” metaphors in the Pauline corpus (justification, redemption, reconciliation, adoption, etc.) also highlight the shared experience of their audience members, thereby increasing their intimacy while minimizing their perceived differences. A metaphor’s creation of intimacy between audience members thus has a profound potential for ecclesiological as well as the more standardly recognized soteriological implications. Furthermore, the potential for ecclesiological impact is true even for metaphors that seem more “vertically” or “individually” oriented (e.g., justification or redemption), since the creation of intimacy is not necessarily linked to the underlying models, which may not be as group-oriented, but rather lies in the act of audience members perceiving themselves together as “the ones who are justified” or “the ones who are redeemed.”

100 Horton observes, “Use of the plural pronoun *we* has been shown to affect judgments of the quality and closeness of interpersonal relationships” (“Metaphor and Readers’ Attributions of Intimacy,” 88).

101 Ibid.

Metaphor and Group Identity

In the first part of this chapter I demonstrated that metaphors affect the way people perceive reality by highlighting certain features of a subject and hiding others. In the previous section I have shown that metaphors increase the feelings of interpersonal closeness between author and audience and among audience members by drawing attention to their common ground. In this section I combine these two features of metaphor in looking at how metaphors influence and construct group identity. It is important to note that not all metaphors have an impact on group identity. Certainly there are metaphors, such as metaphors in literature or metaphors in poetry, which are only intended to reach individual readers, and conversely, there are some metaphors that are so ingrained that they have little chance of functioning to distinguish one group from another.¹⁰² However, when a metaphor is used repeatedly to describe a shared experience of a community, or when it becomes part of a community's vocabulary, it exerts a subtle yet profound influence over the community's understanding of its identity.

Metaphor and the Nature of Group Identity

There is not space here, nor is it my intention, to undertake a full-scale analysis of the formation of group identity, which is a complex and nuanced topic that has been extensively treated elsewhere.¹⁰³ Rather, I will concern myself with the more modest proposal that metaphors (and the *νόθησά* metaphors in particular), along with other factors, played a role in shaping how the early Christian communities perceived themselves and their relationships with "outsiders." The consensus among most sociologists and social-anthropologists is that identity is best described as a dialectic relationship "through which self and other are reciprocally essentialised,"¹⁰⁴ with the recognition that "identity"

102 Though even ingrained metaphors are often culturally contingent and act as boundary markers around a particular culture (Carmen Curcó, "On Mosquitoes and Camels: Some Notes on the Interpretation of Metaphorically Transparent Popular Sayings," in *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz [Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005], 283–307).

103 See especially Atsuhiko Asano, *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Cultural Studies* (JSNTSup 285, London: T & T Clark, 2005) for a study that has integrated insights from cultural anthropology into an analysis of the biblical text; see also Anthony P. Cohen, *The Symbolic Construction of Community* (London: Tavistock, 1985); Richard Jenkins, *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2008).

104 Jon Mitchell, "Identity," in *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, eds. Alan Barnard, and Jonathan Spencer (Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2010), 368.

means different things to different groups. In speaking of group identity, Asano states

The identity of an individual cannot be discussed in isolation from the opinion of "others." The process of "identity" can thus be understood as located both in the core of the individual and within his or her greater communal culture, emphasizing the relationship between the individual and society for understanding one's own identity. Collective identity . . . is found both in the core of communal culture (the particular collectivity) and in the aggregate society at large in which the group is located.¹⁰⁵

As numerous cultural-anthropological studies have demonstrated,¹⁰⁶ a community's symbols, rituals, and language play a significant part in the formation of its collective identity. Simon Firth aptly states, "Identity is thus necessarily a matter of ritual, it describes one's place in a dramatized pattern of relationships,"¹⁰⁷ and further, "Identity . . . comes from the outside not the inside; it is something we put or try on, not something we reveal or discover."¹⁰⁸ As I described earlier in the chapter, a community's metaphors often function as a kind of shorthand for their common experiences, and here I suggest that they also function as an "identity marker" that community members can "try on" or "aggregate around."¹⁰⁹ Because metaphors have somewhat fluid and flexible meanings and a range of potential implications, they are ideally suited to the task of constructing an identity that is both stable enough to function as a boundary marker and fluid enough to easily fit and adapt to the individual differences between community members.¹¹⁰ In the following sections I will briefly examine how these dynamics of stability and elasticity allow metaphors to solidify group boundaries and embody group experience.

105 Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 37.

106 See especially Turner, *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors*; Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney, "Embedding and Transforming Polytrope: The Monkey as Self in Japanese Culture," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 159–89; Deborah Durham and James W. Fernandez, "Tropical Dominions: The Figurative Struggle over Domains of Belonging and Apartness in Africa," in *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 190–212.

107 Firth, "Music and Identity," 125.

108 *Ibid.*, 122.

109 Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 35.

110 *Ibid.*, 39.

Metaphor and Solidifying Group Boundaries

We saw in the previous sections that a metaphor influences the perceptions and emotions of individuals and, as a counterpart, in this section I will argue that within a group a metaphor “anchors and choreographs the collective consciousness.”¹¹¹ Within groups, metaphors construct and solidify boundaries for group members by their ability to supply a filter through which group members can delineate the “in-group” from “outsiders.” We can see this filtering function well in the example I gave above of spiritual circumcision in contrast to the circumcision of the flesh (Rom 2:25–29; Col 2:11–15, Gal 5:2–3; 6:13–15; Eph 2:11; Phil 3:2–3), or in more contemporary metaphorical labels such as “white collar,” “blue collar,” and “redneck.” When group members use these labels to describe themselves, or when group leaders use them to describe the collective, the metaphors organize and structure the collective consciousness such that the world is split between “circumcision” and “uncircumcision” or between “blue collar” and “white collar,” and a stable boundary is formed around the group. It is also worth pointing out that these metaphors often do not merely illuminate boundaries that already exist, but rather as performative utterances they aid in creating them. Zhang observes that metaphor “offers a way in which a collectivity can come into being in the first place.”¹¹² In the most insidious cases, such as in the cases of the political propaganda campaigns accompanying genocide that were mentioned above, the performative nature of metaphor creates boundaries so absolute that they utterly devalue the “others” and strip them of their humanity itself. Even in less extreme cases, such as describing a spouse as “my other half,” the metaphor still constructs and solidifies a stable and firm boundary around the married couple and excludes all other people (since the metaphor necessitates that there are only two halves to a whole).

Metaphors also create boundaries around the collective through highlighting the shared common ground between community members, and excluding outsiders who “just don’t get it.”¹¹³ To illustrate this principle, Cohen gives a rather funny example of his father and a friend describing a deficient brand or bottle of beer as “green beer.” In recounting this, Cohen remarks,

Although I have tried and tried—by talking and by tasting—I have never known what these men were talking about. I often agreed that the beer wasn’t perfect. I found it flat or stale or bitter, but none of those is what

111 Zhang, “Corporate Identity Metaphor,” 388.

112 Ibid.

113 Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.

'green' means. I frankly don't care too much whether we like the same beers . . . but I desperately want to know what a beer tastes like when it tastes green.¹¹⁴

In Cohen's case, the metaphor is unintelligible because he does not share the common ground necessary to join the community of green beer drinkers (i.e., he cannot perform a mental simulation of the taste of green beer), and thus the metaphor creates a boundary around that particular community. Perhaps a parallel example from the New Testament would be Paul's description of Christ as Ἰουδαίοις . . . σκάνδαλον (a stumbling block for the Jews) (1 Cor 1:23) but for the "insiders" of the Corinthian community Christ is ὁ θεμέλιος (the cornerstone) (1 Cor 3:10–15). These metaphors create boundaries between insiders and outsiders by appealing to the common ground and experiential knowledge the Corinthians share regarding who Christ is. Other examples of metaphorical descriptions of shared group experiences among early Christian communities include being: "washed," "sanctified," and "justified" (1 Cor 6:11), and "crucified with Christ" (Gal 2:20; Rom 6:6–7). Though outsiders might be able to understand in part what it might mean for a Christian to describe him or herself as "crucified with Christ," or "sanctified," only those inside the community share the necessary common ground of experiential knowledge to fully appreciate the metaphor, and thus the metaphor has formed a boundary.

Metaphor as an Embodiment of Group Identity

If the stability of a metaphor's meaning aids in creating boundaries around a particular group, then its elasticity of meaning permits group members to adapt and "stretch" it to fit their individual differences while still speaking to the common ground of the collective. Zhang observes that metaphors "are simultaneously consubstantiating and individuating," and a metaphor "opens up a psychological space for individuals to co-inhabit."¹¹⁵ When a community takes up a metaphor, it becomes an embodiment of identity and experience both for the individual and the collective as a whole. As Raymond Gibbs articulates, "metaphors are primary devices for the representation of experience . . . it is clear that metaphor provides the basis for communities' understandings of some aspects of their collective experience."¹¹⁶ A prime example of this is the kinship metaphor applied to members of early Christian communities in numerous instances in the New Testament. The structural metaphor

114 Ted Cohen, "Some Philosophy: 1," *Raritan* 10.2 (1990): 30.

115 Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.

116 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 192.

“COMMUNITY IS A FAMILY” underlies the references to “brothers and sisters,” “God the Father,” and if God is Father then by extension Jesus is both “Son” and “brother,” (Rom 8:29).¹¹⁷ Furthermore, Paul can speak of Timothy as his “true son” in the faith (1 Tim 1:2; Titus 1:4), himself as both a mother (1 Thess 2:7; Gal 4:19) and a father (1 Thess 2:11), and the members of the community as his children (1 Cor 4:14; 2 Cor 6:13; Gal 4:19). Given the prevalence of this metaphor in the New Testament epistles, it is clear that “COMMUNITY IS A FAMILY” choreographs the collective identity (or at least one facet of it) of early Christian communities.

Furthermore, as performative expressions of the collective identity, metaphors create space for group members to experience and participate in the collective identity by “trying on” or “aggregating around” the metaphor. As figurative and evocative language, metaphors give voice to the experiences of community members; they become for the community embodiments of their collective joy, sorrow, pain, struggle, protest, alienation, and so on. We see an excellent example of this function of metaphor within the Anabaptist tradition in the language of many of the martyr stories in the *Martyrs Mirror*.¹¹⁸ The *Martyrs Mirror* itself is a symbol of community identity for those in the Anabaptist tradition, and as Dave and Neta Jackson remark, “is a book more widely known about than actually read.”¹¹⁹ However, the metaphors one encounters in many of the martyr stories have functioned powerfully to shape the ethos and identity of Anabaptist communities from the time when the *Martyrs Mirror* was first published in 1660 until the present day.¹²⁰ The stories of the Anabaptist martyrs are filled with grisly and gory details of drownings, beheadings, torture, and so forth, but throughout the *Martyrs Mirror* many of these narratives are framed by two prominent and interrelated metaphors: “sacrificial offering” and “slaughtered sheep.”

To illustrate the importance and centrality of these two metaphors, let us look briefly at the account of Dirk Willems, who holds an especially prominent place in the cultural and theological identity of Anabaptist communities.

117 Pace Aasgaard, “My Beloved Brothers and Sisters,” 145–50; Aasgaard’s argument regarding Paul’s family map in Romans 8 will be addressed in more detail in chapter 6.

118 *The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians* (Scottsdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951).

119 Dave and Neta Jackson, *On Fire for Christ: Stories of Anabaptist Martyrs* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989), 15.

120 In drawing from *Martyrs Mirror* I do not intend to make claims regarding their veracity. Rather, I am using the example to demonstrate the power that metaphorical framing exerts on community identity.

Willems was arrested in 1569 and “had to endure severe tyranny from the papists.”¹²¹ The *Martyrs Mirror* records that Willems “remained immovable and steadfast unto the end; wherefore, when the *chief Shepherd* shall appear in the clouds of heaven . . . he shall also through the grace hear the words: ‘Well done, good and faithful servant.’”¹²² According to the *Martyrs Mirror*, Willems was apprehended when he chose to save the life of his would-be captor who had fallen through some thin ice while in pursuit of Willems. After Willems had pulled the man out of the water, the “thief-catcher” handed him over to the burgomaster, and Willems was subjected to “severe imprisonment and great trials proceeding from the deceitful papists.”¹²³ The “papists” are further described as “bloodthirsty, ravening wolves,” and Willems’ death is referred to later as “this offering.”¹²⁴

It is plainly evident even in this brief example that the metaphors used in recounting Willems’ apprehension and execution are not neutral descriptions of the events. God is described as the “Chief Shepherd,” which by extension makes Willems a “sheep,” and his accusers “bloodthirsty wolves.” The whole of the narrative is thus recast as an enactment of John 10 or Ezekiel 34. Willems’ innocent suffering is highlighted, and the metaphors set a firm boundary in place between the Anabaptist “sheep,” and the papist “wolves.” In addition to the account of Willems’ martyrdom, similar metaphors occur in many other martyr stories in the *Martyrs Mirror*. The martyrs are called “defenseless sheep,”¹²⁵ “lambs of Christ for the slaughter,”¹²⁶ and the “little flock,”¹²⁷ and their executioners are repeatedly referred to as “wolves.” Because the *Martyrs Mirror* occupies such a prominent place in Anabaptist communities, the Anabaptist readers begin to “put these stories on,” and imagine their own experiences through the lens of these stories. Consequently these stories, and the metaphors in them, powerfully influence Anabaptist identity. Moreover, these metaphors are sufficiently “elastic” that they are easily expandable to other instances of suffering that community members may experience as a result of their nonconformity.¹²⁸ Thus, having been steeped in the rhetoric of

121 *Martyrs Mirror*, 741.

122 *Ibid.* (emph. mine).

123 *Ibid.*

124 *Ibid.*

125 *Ibid.*, 356.

126 *Ibid.*, 633.

127 *Ibid.*, 738.

128 See James W. Lowry, “The Martyrs’ Mirror: A Mirror of Nonresistance,” *Mennonite Life* 45.3 (1990): 36–44.

the *Martyrs Mirror*, Anabaptists undergoing persecution in other times and places may also perceive themselves as “innocent sheep” among the “wolves,” and they also may view their suffering and martyrdom as a “sacrificial offering.”

The metaphorical descriptions woven into the martyr stories provide an easily digested ideological framework that now is part of the bedrock of many Anabaptist communities.¹²⁹ The martyr stories taught Anabaptists to view nonconformity and nonresistance as their “sacrificial offering,” which is to be steadfastly given in obedience to their “Chief Shepherd” who cares for his flock.¹³⁰ Though the metaphors used in early Christian communities are further removed by time and space, I would suggest that some were just as powerful and influential as embodiments of group experience in their time as the metaphorical framing of the stories in *Martyrs Mirror* was, and continues to be, for Anabaptist communities. The believers in first-century Christian communities too often filled out the New Testament’s narrative of suffering with their own flesh and blood. And while the metaphors of the New Testament are rich in theological significance, *they also give voice to the experiences of the first followers of Jesus*. Just as the Anabaptists regarded their persecution and martyrdom as “sacrificial offering,” so too “being crucified with Christ” (Gal 2:20) or “being poured out like a drink offering” (2 Tim 4:6) or “carrying the marks of Jesus” (Gal 6:17) were phrases and symbols that embodied the collective identity of the early Christians. Likewise, metaphors like “justification,” “redemption,” and “adoption” are embodiments of the collective experience of what it means to be ἐν Χριστῷ (in Christ) and create psychological space for the community to express their joy and thanksgiving. Since metaphors can act as formative agents within collective identity, in the exegetical chapters we will consider how the υἱοθεσία metaphors in particular might have expressed, embodied, and shaped the collective experience of the churches in Galatia and Rome.

129 See C. Arnold Snyder, *Following in the Footsteps of Christ: The Anabaptist Tradition* (New York: Orbis Books, 2004), 159–83.

130 I note here that the reception history and legacy of *Martyrs Mirror* is fraught with complexity and cannot be described in wholly positive terms. However, there is no doubting the power these stories have exerted on Anabaptist identity, particularly in German and Swiss Anabaptist traditions. See also John D. Roth, “The Complex Legacy of the *Martyrs Mirror* among Mennonites in North America,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 87.3 (2013): 277–316; see also A. Orley Swartzentruber, “The Piety and Theology of the Anabaptist Martyrs in van Bracht’s *Martyrs’ Mirror*,” *The Mennonite Quarterly Review* 28.2 (1954): 5–26.

Conclusion

The intention of this chapter was to provide a methodological complement to the features of metaphor addressed by philosophical metaphor theories. As stated previously, philosophical and practical approaches are not typically integrated into a single methodology. However, because biblical metaphors have both textual and extra-textual features, a methodology is needed that addresses the impact metaphors have on both of these areas. In order to address a metaphor's impact on extra-textual features, this chapter has considered the cognitive and affective potential metaphors have on their hearers/readers, and has sought to demonstrate the relevance of these areas for exegesis. It began by examining how metaphors influence an individual's perception by providing a particular cognitive framework or mental simulation that highlights some features of a subject while hiding others. The following section contemplated the potential of metaphors to evoke emotions within an individual, which in some cases holds more sway than a metaphor's cognitive content. I then discussed a metaphor's capability of creating intimacy between author and audience and between audience members by drawing on their shared common ground to create a "sameness of vision" and feelings of interpersonal closeness. The last part of the chapter dealt with the complex topic of metaphor and group identity, where I suggested that the elasticity and stability of metaphors makes them ideally suited to create and solidify boundaries between group members and outsiders and function as embodiments of group experience.

The features of metaphor discussed in this chapter are not often utilized in an analysis of a biblical metaphor, but I will show in the second part of this work that they bring a richness to the understanding of Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphors that has largely gone unnoticed. Attending to the extra-textual features of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors will open new areas of inquiry, such as the metaphors' ability to elicit a variety of emotional responses from their audiences, and the potential impact the *υιοθεσία* metaphors have on forming or reforming community identity around the metaphorical *familia Dei* where ethnic distinctions are preserved but are no longer salient. However, before proceeding to the exegesis of the *υιοθεσία* texts I will first focus on filling in the underlying cultural models of *υιοθεσία*, which themselves form the basis for the possible mental simulations in Paul's first audiences.

Sketching the Model: The Background and Conventional Use of *ὑιοθεσία*

Introduction

The connection between metaphor and model was already briefly discussed in the second chapter of this study,¹ but here it is necessary to analyze the underlying model(s) for the metaphorical uses of *ὑιοθεσία* in more depth. In the second chapter I noted that metaphors rely on models in order to communicate meaning to the audience, and that these models are the basis for the mental simulations that hearers/readers perform. Recall also that this study will rely on Greg Dawes's definition of a model as "a consistent imaginative construct or (if one prefers) a consistent pattern of thought by means of which apparently isolated phenomena may be seen to be related to one another."² For the purpose of this study's working definition of metaphor, a metaphor's model is the object or state of affairs that exists in the "real world" that provides the cognitive framework and mental simulation for a metaphor. For example, Black's metaphor "Man is a wolf" relies on the model "wolf" as the concrete object that provides the metaphor's structure and framework.

However, since metaphors do not always appear in the form "X is a Y," it is important to state here that the model need not necessarily be a term present in the text of a metaphor. We observe this in Alfred Lord Tennyson's "Crossing the Bar."

Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea.³

Here Tennyson relies on the extended metaphor of a ship putting out to sea and "crossing the bar" (the sandbar that acts as a barrier between the shallow harbor and the deep sea beyond) as a poetic description of death. Notice that this metaphor evokes several models, which possibly include: a ship, the tide,

¹ See chapter 2.

² Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.

³ Alfred Lord Tennyson, "Crossing the Bar," lines 1–4.

the harbor, and the sea beyond, and this metaphor thus creates a vivid mental simulation of a ship's journey out to sea with the attendant sights, sounds, smells, and so forth. Taking Dawes's definition then, Tennyson's poem nudges the reader to imagine death through "the consistent pattern of thought" of a ship journeying over the bar to the ocean beyond. However, only the bar is explicitly mentioned in the text. Indeed, powerfully evocative metaphors often only allude to their underlying models rather than stating them overtly. Strong metaphors (metaphors that are both resonant and emphatic), suggest models that enable the audience to "go on awhile" with contemplating the metaphor's implications. Tennyson's evocation of a ship, the bar, and the sea beyond allows the reader to continue quite awhile in her ruminations about death's journey. Is the harbor calm and peaceful? Is the weather cloudy, misty, or clear? Will the ship move smoothly across the bar, or will it moan, as Tennyson fears? Perhaps most significantly, "Crossing the Bar" illustrates that much of the selection and association of models occurs in the mind of the reader as he or she encounters the written words of the author. Tennyson may have had a particular ship and a particular bar in mind, but it is not in the nature of metaphor to demand that his audience mentally simulates precisely the same set of models that he himself envisioned. However, the vocabulary of the metaphorical utterance also, to some degree at least, constrains the possible models the reader is likely to simulate. For example, although "bar" has the potential to evoke concrete objects, places, or states of affairs that are unrelated to Tennyson's poem (e.g., a piece of metal or wood, a drinking establishment, and so on), the frame of the metaphorical utterance eliminates such models from consideration because of its nautical terminology (e.g., the sea, the sunset, and the clear call). Thus although metaphors often evoke a plurality of models, some models are more salient than others because of the constraints imposed by the frame of the metaphorical utterance.

Furthermore, neither do the models invoked by a metaphor need to have a one-to-one correspondence with the vehicle of the metaphor. Take for example T. S. Eliot's "The Hollow Men,"

We are the hollow men
 We are the stuffed men
 Leaning together
 Headpiece filled with straw. Alas!
 Our dried voices, when
 We whisper together
 Are quiet and meaningless.⁴

4 T. S. Eliot, "The Hollow Men," lines 1–7.

Though it may be possible to argue that Eliot's metaphor "We are the hollow men," framed in an "X is a Y" construct picks out the particular model "hollow men,"⁵ the adjectival metaphor "dried voices" conjures up a range of possible models or, as Soskice observes, "entities of which the term would customarily be predicated."⁶ "Dried" might lead the reader to simulate withered grass, dried meat, dried flowers, dry wood, dry skin, and so on. However, the possibility for a plurality of models, or the lack of a one-to-one correspondence between a metaphor and its model, need not trouble us if we remember that the function of the model is to provide the framework through which the metaphor's tenor and vehicle are related to one another in the mind of the reader/hearer. Certainly "withered grass" and "dried meat" both provide a "consistent pattern of thought" for the metaphor, it is just not the *same* pattern of thought or simulation. Therefore, readers who simulate different models will understand, perceive, and be affected by the metaphor in slightly different ways. This is an important feature of the relationship between a metaphor and its possible models that must be kept in mind during the exegetical process.

Because a model provides the underlying structure of a metaphor, it is by entertaining various aspects of a model that the audience is moved to discover and consider a metaphor's diverse implications. To take a simple example, the metaphor "the brain is a computer" relies on "computer" as its underlying model, and as such allows its reader to entertain implications like: "thoughts are electric impulses," "memories are saved on the hard drive," or memories as "files" can become "corrupt," brains can be "hardwired" for certain behaviors, and so on. Since biblical metaphors also rely on models to provide the framework through which to consider their implications, the first step toward determining possible implications of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors must be the delineation of their possible underlying model or models. Moreover, determining the possible underlying models for the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors is especially important since contemporary interpreters are culturally and temporally removed from their original setting, and thus care must be taken that current notions are not imported into the underlying model.

The model or models which underlie the *υιοθεσία* metaphors are closely connected with the conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία*. By "conventional" I mean the general semantic field of the word as it occurs in non-figurative settings.⁷ However, a metaphor's model is not synonymous with its conventional

5 Though it is still difficult to say precisely what Eliot means by "hollow men."

6 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 50.

7 This is not necessarily to say that the conventional meaning of a word is always nonfigurative (e.g., the "stem" of a glass or the "leg" of a table are both conventional and figurative), but the

definition. This is easily observable in our example of “dried voices” where “dried” evokes images of dried things, and the models are not restricted to the abstract definition and conventional meaning “free of moisture.” Rather, in addition to the conventional meaning, the model underlying a metaphor also includes the possible images, feelings, and associations that might accompany it. Therefore sketching the model for the *υιοθεσία* metaphors must also ask questions such as: What sorts of people were adopted? What social connotations did adoption carry? What circumstances typically gave rise to a father’s choice to adopt? What did the legal act of adoption accomplish? What texts or traditions would a person familiar with Jewish practices be likely to associate with adoption? For answers to these questions it is necessary to go beyond the evidence for the legal procedures and examine the cultural assumptions and social mores that form the foundation for the legal practices of first-century adoption. Furthermore, the relationship between the model of *υιοθεσία* and the identification of its appropriate background, which has been the focus of several previous studies, must be rethought. I will show below that a model cannot be reduced to a single background text, that possible backgrounds and texts cannot be neatly separated from one another, and that it is likely that each possible background both interprets and is interpreted by the others.

Rather than pinning a strictly Jewish, Greek, or Roman background to *υιοθεσία*,⁸ this chapter will weigh all of these possible models because each has the possibility of contributing to the overall meaning of the metaphors in its Pauline context, as both the author and the audience members could feasibly have been influenced by all three backgrounds. The analysis below will also demonstrate that casting a wide net for the possible models of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors is necessary because of the indeterminate nature of metaphors as communicative acts.⁹ Though previous studies on the possible background of the Pauline use of *υιοθεσία* have tended to focus on the most likely background with regard to authorial intent, I argued in the previous chapter that Paul’s intended meaning as the author is only one part of the communicative process.¹⁰ Rather, metaphors by nature, invite the *audience* to explore a range

lexical evidence that determines the conventional meaning for *υιοθεσία* is almost entirely nonfigurative. The connection between model and conventional meaning is also discussed in chapter 1.

8 This has been the approach of many previous studies on the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphors; e.g., Byrne, “*Sons of God*”; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*; Burke, *Adopted into God’s Family*.

9 This was discussed in detail in chapter 1.

10 The role of the audience is discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

of possible implications and simulations that cannot be wholly determined by the author. Therefore, since the letters were read in the context of community, and the communities at Rome and Galatia were comprised of diverse social and ethnic backgrounds, consideration must be given to all possible models $\nu\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ might potentially conjure for the various perspectives present within the original audience.¹¹

Conventional Meaning, Background, and Translation: Some Methodological Considerations

As seen in the examples above, a metaphor's model consists of the associations, mental simulations, and thought structures created by its conventional word meaning or semantic domain.¹² Therefore, studies that investigate the appropriate background and conventional meaning of $\nu\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ are helpful insofar as they delineate its semantic range; determining the conventional meaning of the word aids in selecting or ruling out various models and mental simulations. Necessarily then, the appropriate translation of $\nu\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ is of central concern because its translation is an attempt by exegetes to pick out the appropriate conventional meaning and background of the metaphor. In the case of $\nu\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ there are two possible translations scholars have put forth: "sonship" and "adoption." The sections below will first examine the evidence

11 It is my contention that the communities in question were predominantly composed of gentiles but may have included a Jewish minority. This issue will be addressed more thoroughly in the introduction to the exegetical chapters on Romans and Galatians (see chapters 5 and 6). Suffice to note here that there have been some recent proponents of a solely gentile background for Romans and Galatians, who therefore see Paul's use of adoption as a way of legitimating gentile converts; see especially Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*. Hodge is highly influenced by Stanley Stowers, who states that "the letter [Romans] characterizes its readers unambiguously as *gentile Christians*" (*A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and gentiles* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994], 30). Stowers also argues that interpreters who purport that Paul's letter might have been addressed to a mixed audience "ignore or disallow the letter's explicitly encoded audience" (ibid). Stowers and Hodge believe Paul was concerned with constructing a new community norm for gentile converts, and not with changing or challenging the accepted community norms of Judaism; see also Mark Nanos, "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?," in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark Nanos [Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002], 300–316.

12 See also the discussion on model and conventional meaning in chapter 1.

for the conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία* and then evaluate two possible translations of *υιοθεσία* in the Pauline texts.

The Conventional Meaning of υιοθεσία

It is necessary to begin with an assessment of the semantic domain of *υιοθεσία* in order to lay the appropriate foundation for the underlying models of the Pauline metaphor. Determining the conventional definition of *υιοθεσία* must involve an examination of the legal and social uses of the word, and in light of previous studies it must also consider the possibility that Paul is evoking a concept from Jewish texts even if *υιοθεσία* itself does not appear in these texts. In delineating the conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία* it is important to bear in mind James Barr's warning that, "as soon . . . as the social acceptance of words is neglected . . . an opening is given to those interpretations which . . . are remote from the actual semantic indication."¹³ Thus in heeding Barr's warning the translation of *υιοθεσία* in the Pauline text must attend to its social use that would have been recognizable to Paul's first-century audience alongside the concern to bring out possible theological meanings of *υιοθεσία* as it relates to Israel's history.

Reasons for beginning with the best-attested conventional meaning of *υιοθεσία* become clearer if we consider a simple example where a small divergence in conventional meaning results in a greater divergence in the meaning of a metaphorical utterance. For example, the Greek word *δοῦλος* unequivocally denotes "a service which is not a matter of choice for the one who renders it, which he has to perform whether he likes it or not, because he is subject as a slave to an alien will, to the will of his owner,"¹⁴ and it is translated "slave" when predicated of persons literally in bound service to another or when the metaphor indicates a negative relationship between the *δοῦλος*/*δούλη* and his or her master.¹⁵ However, *δοῦλος* is often translated "servant" when it is a metaphorical predicate of a positive slave/master relationship.¹⁶ Presumably to soften the connotations of "slave" for the contemporary reader in the NRSV, Paul is designated a "servant of Jesus Christ (*Παῦλος δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*/Paul, a slave of Christ Jesus [Rom 1:1])," the disciples make the transition from "servants" to "friends" of Jesus (*οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους . . . ὑμᾶς δὲ εἵρηκα φίλους*/I no longer call you slaves . . . I have called you friends [John 15:15]), and 2 Timothy gives

13 James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961), 213.

14 *TDNT*, 2: 261.

15 E.g., Matt 6:24; 13:27; Luke 7:2; John 8:35; Rom 6:16–17 NRSV.

16 E.g., Rom 1:1; 2 Tim 2:24; Rev 15:3 NRSV.

moral guidance for those wishing to be a “servant of the Lord” (δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι ἀλλ’ ἡπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας/and the slave of the Lord must not be quarrelsome but gentle toward all [2 Tim 2:24]). However, translating δοῦλος with “servant” rather than “slave” slightly alters the underlying model and corresponding mental simulation that a contemporary reader associates with these metaphorical predications. While the translation and corresponding model of “servant” may reflect an individual’s voluntary submission to God or Christ and make the designation more palatable to contemporary sensibilities, it misses the element of “ownership” or “lordship” that is most certainly present in the model of “slave.” The translation “servant” loses the totality of Paul’s submission to Christ as δοῦλος in Romans 1:1,¹⁷ and it potentially misses the enormity of the change in the disciples’ status in John 15:15. Thus deriving a translation from the best-attested conventional meaning of a word is necessary to capturing the full nuance of the metaphorical utterances in which it occurs.

Having established the importance of beginning with the best-attested conventional meaning of υἰοθεσία as a starting point for sketching the underlying model, I turn now to the specific lexical evidence for this word and its word group, which occurs primarily in legal documents and inscriptions. Scott identifies a series of terms commonly used interchangeably with υἰοθεσία that are part of the same semantic domain: εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἰοποιεῖσθαι, υἰοθετεῖν.¹⁸ Words from this semantic domain are also noticeably absent from the LXX, which strongly suggests that their conventional meanings must be sought in other Greek and Roman sources.¹⁹ Within Greco-Roman sources, υἰοθεσία and other members of its semantic domain are always used to denote adoptive sonship, and never used to express the sonship of a natural or biological son.²⁰ This is particularly clear in evidence from inscriptions where terms of adoption are used to record the adoptive parentage alongside

17 See also Michael J. Brown, “Paul’s use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1,” *JBL* 120.4 (2001): 723–37.

18 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 13.

19 Pace Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 6–8.

20 For examples of Greek epigraphical evidence of adoption see Mario Serge, *Iscrizioni di Cos* (Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2007), no. 854; Peter Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007), 31–32, 64; Marie-France Auzépy, “Campagne de prospection 2007 de la mission Marmara,” *Anatolia Antiqua* 15 (2007): 342–43; Hasan Malay, and Marijana Riel, “Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia,” *EA* 39 (2006): 71 no. 45; Klaus Hallof, ed., *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icarique* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003), no. 837, 838; for discussion of Latin epigraphical evidence see Christiane Kunst, *Römische Adoption: Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation*

the son's (or daughter's) natural father. For example, an inscription dating from the third century BCE from Rhodes reads:

Ἀπολλόδοτον, Πολυκράτειος
καθ' ὕθεσίαν δε Σωσιστράτου

Apollodotos, son of Polycrates,
son of Sosistratos according to adoption.²¹

Numerous examples such as the one above, which utilize similar adoption formulae, while also recording the natural parentage of the child, indicate unambiguously that these terms denote an adoptive relationship.²² Moreover, of the possible terms available, epigraphical evidence points to *ὑόθεσία* being among the most common terms for adoption in Hellenistic Greek.²³ The majority of instances of *ὑόθεσία* occur in various inscriptions, in contrast to members of the *εἰσποιεῖν* word group which are much more prevalent in literary sources.²⁴ As Scott's survey of literary sources has shown,²⁵ there is a marked difference in the vocabulary between epigraphical and literary sources, and non-literary sources comprise a substantial amount of the evidence for first-century adoption.

The epigraphical evidence for adoption in Greek sources comes from a wide range of inscriptions discovered in multiple locations spanning several centuries, indicating that Greek and Roman practices of adoption were widespread and common, though the formulae used to convey adoption are by no means uniform.²⁶ Christiane Kunst correctly notes that the epigraphic evidence for

(Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge 10, Hennef: Marthe Clauss, 2005), 253–57; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50–70; see also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 1–57.

21 Erhard Grzybek, "Rhodische Inschriften," *ZPE* 165 (2008): 68–69.

22 For a catalogue of such examples see Martin Smith, "Greek Adoptive Formulae," *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 303–307.

23 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 55.

24 The *εἰσποιεῖν* word group figures prominently Isaeus (2.10; 3.60; 6.22; 9.7; 10.9) and Demosthenes (e.g., 44.23, 26, 34). The verb in the active voice as a pejorative use, and in the middle voice as a neutral term of adoption, and the adjective (used most often as a substantive) and the noun also occur in both neutral and pejorative contexts. See also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 14–24.

25 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 45.

26 For discussions of Greek epigraphic evidence from a variety of dates and locations, see e.g., Sabine R. Huebner, "'Brother-Sister' Marriage in Roman Egypt: A Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy," *JRS* 97 (2007): 27–40; Grzybek, "Rhodische Inschriften," 72–73; Pierre Debord, "Religion et Société: Les Fêtes D'Hécate et de Zeus

adoption presents numerous difficulties because “geht sie fast nie mit einem Wechsel des Namen oder der Filiation des Adoptierten einher.”²⁷ Indeed, in many inscriptions words from the semantic domain of adoption do not appear at all, and adoption is indicated by the juxtaposition of two fathers, the second of whom is designated “φύσει δὲ . . .” indicating that the first father listed was the son’s adoptive father.²⁸ For example, a funerary inscription from the Cayster Valley dated to the Roman Imperial Period reads:

Νίκανδρε Ἀρτεμιδώ-
ρου, φύσει δὲ Μηνο-
γένου *vacat* καίῃρε

Nikandros, son of Artemidoros, by birth of Menogenes, farewell!²⁹

What is striking about the “φύσει δὲ . . .” gloss is that it demonstrates that adoption was prevalent enough for it to be unnecessary to designate the adoptive father using a clarifying term from the semantic domain of adoption. In addition, although adoptions are frequently recorded in the lineage of a son, Kunst makes the interesting observation that adoption inscriptions only rarely specify what precipitated the act of adoption.³⁰ This detail perhaps further evidences the high level of social acceptance for kinship created through adoption. Moreover, Martin Smith identifies adoptive formulae involving ὕθεσία or υἱοθεσία to be the most widespread and prevalent formulae in inscriptions, and further catalogues abbreviations of these adoptive formulae, which “in itself is an indication that people were familiar with the institution of adoption.”³¹ The majority of these inscriptions have been located in Rhodes, and the earliest are dated from before 200 BCE. Later Rhodian inscriptions (from the first and

à Stratonice de Carie,” in *Espaces et Pouvoirs dans l'Antiquité de l'Anatolie à la Gaule*, ed. Julie Dalaison (Grenoble: CRHIPA, 2007), 239–50; Hallof, *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami*, no. 837, 838; Malay and Riel, “Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia,” 71.

27 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 24.

28 See e.g., Malay and Riel, “Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia,” 71; Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia*, 31–32; for an interesting case recording the adoption of a daughter using the φύσει δὲ formula see N. Eda Akyürek Şahin, “Eine neue Ehrung für den Kaiser Domitian aus Bursa,” in *Euergetes: Festschrift für Pro. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. İnci Delemen (Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü, 2008), 79–81.

29 Malay and Riel, “Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia,” 71.

30 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 23.

31 Smith, “Greek Adoptive Formulae,” 304.

second century BCE) often utilize abbreviations for adoption, indicating, as Smith notes, that the practice was widespread.³²

That υιοθεσία is a term to designate the adoption of a son becomes even clearer when it is juxtaposed in a single context with terms denoting a natural son, which occurs several times in literary sources. Writing in the first century BCE, Diodorus describes both the birth and adoptive lineage of Scipio, who was “given in adoption (δοθεὶς δὲ εἰς υιοθεσίαν)” as evidence of his high pedigree. In reference to both his birth and adoptive genealogies, Diodorus lauds Publius Scipio saying, “Sprung from such stock, and succeeding to a family and clan of such importance, he showed himself worthy of the fame of his ancestors.”³³ A parallel example using another form of adoptive formula is recorded by Isaeus, who says “the same law applies both when someone introduces a natural son (τινα φύσει γεγονότα) or an adopted son (ποιητόν).”³⁴ The contrast between a natural son and an adopted son clearly underscores the distinction between birth and adoption as means of creating kinship, and leave little room for doubt that the words from the semantic domain (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) are used in reference to the act of adoption or to persons who have been adopted, and not to the general status of sonship.

Moreover, in addition to the many attestations of words from the semantic domain of adoption from inscriptions and other literary sources, Kunst has persuasively argued that the performance of adoption, and adoptive and quasi-adoptive relationships, were much more common than has been previously recognized.³⁵ She asserts that although the evidence from literary sources presents adoption as a clearly defined and straightforward legal procedure, a closer examination of both literary and epigraphical sources reveals both formal and informal instances of adoption that were modified to meet the individual requirements of families who needed to procure an offspring.³⁶ Due to the high degree of autonomy of the Roman household from legal regulation, Kunst argues that in addition to formal legal proceedings, the Roman household as a “quasi state-free space” gave rise to a form of social adoption, which was often legally recognized *ex post facto*.³⁷ Surveying the lexical evidence for Roman adoption likewise reveals that adoption was a highly adaptable social

32 Ibid.

33 Diodorus of Sicily, xxxi 26.4 (Walton, LCL).

34 Isaeus, 7.15–16 (Forster, LCL).

35 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*.

36 Ibid., 291–99.

37 Ibid., 194.

practice, especially among powerful households.³⁸ Suzanne Dixon remarks that the prevalent practice of adoption fits the Roman family's "readiness to extend relationships."³⁹ In light of the literary and epigraphical evidence there is little doubt that υιοθεσία is a term used to designate the adoption of a son, but it is also important to recognize that, given the diversity of its use in the literary and epigraphical evidence, it does not necessarily denote a specific legal procedure.

For the purpose of establishing the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία, the varied evidence from inscriptions and legal sources gives the impression that the practice of adoption was part of the social and cultural consciousness in the first century, which leads to the sure conclusion that υιοθεσία was a term designating "adoption." Moreover, given the prevalence of the social practice it is certain that this conventional understanding would have been familiar to Paul's audience. Thus, having here established that the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία, drawn from the lexical evidence in literary sources and inscriptions, undoubtedly denotes "adoption" rather than the more general "sonship," and having shown that the practice of adoption was relatively common by the first century CE in the Greco-Roman world, this evidence must now be weighed against contextual and intertextual considerations for the translation of υιοθεσία in the Pauline texts. The following sections will evaluate the possible translations of υιοθεσία in the context of Paul's letters, which possibly have been influenced not only by its attested social meaning but also by its relationship to precursory texts in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature.

Other Proposed Translations, Backgrounds, and Models

"Sonship" and Jewish Background

Despite acknowledging that υιοθεσία in Greco-Roman sources denotes adoption, proponents of "sonship" as an appropriate translation of υιοθεσία seek to translate the term in a way that gives due deference to Israel's designation as "son" in the Old Testament and other Jewish literature.⁴⁰ For example, in his desire to stress the continuity between the Old Testament and Paul, Byrne, in his monograph *"Sons of God"—"Seed of Abraham,"* has mounted a formidable defense of reading all of the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία in light of an exclusively Jewish background and translating each Pauline occurrence

38 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 54.

39 Suzanne Dixon, *The Roman Family* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 162.

40 E.g., Byrne, *"Sons of God,"* 1–8; Ronald Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 179; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC, Dallas: Word Books, 1990), 172.

“sonship” rather than “adoption.” At the outset of his monograph, Byrne states “the present study has the . . . modest aim of taking a cue from Paul’s own presentation and reading him in the light of his Jewish background.”⁴¹ In his study, Byrne argues that υιοθεσία in the Pauline corpus must denote “sonship” rather than “adoption” because adoption is not a Jewish practice, whereas the sonship of Israel was a well-worn image within Judaism.⁴² An overarching area of Byrne’s thesis that requires some revision, which I will undertake in more detail below, is that it does not address how metaphors relate to their underlying models. However, more immediately problematic are Byrne’s methodological assumptions that intertextuality is a one-directional process where models and translations can feasibly be constructed “out of” precursory texts, and his neglect of the role the audience plays in a metaphor’s interpretation. Because his study was published in 1979, it is understandable that Byrne does not engage in a methodological defense of his intertextual approach since intertextuality was in its nascent stages in biblical studies.⁴³ However, as I noted previously,⁴⁴ more recent studies on intertextuality have sharply questioned hermeneutical approaches such as the one Byrne adopts, and in light of the advances in intertextual methodologies, Byrne’s thesis requires some revision before his proposed Jewish background material can be considered as part of the underlying model of υιοθεσία.

To support his claim that υιοθεσία is the Pauline equivalent to well-established expressions of sonship within Judaism, Byrne uses various texts from the Old Testament and intertestamental literature to demonstrate that “sonship” is indeed a category already firmly established in Jewish thought. Thus, Byrne argues that in light of these texts υιοθεσία must be translated “sonship” in its Pauline occurrences to reflect this Jewish background rather than the Greco-Roman practices of adoption. According to Byrne, Jewish sonship is an “expression of the bond between Yahweh and his people,” and, “the unique privilege of Israel as the people chosen and created by Yahweh for himself.”⁴⁵

41 Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 7.

42 Ibid., 81.

43 Richard Hays remarks, “Biblical critics are sometimes a little slow on the uptake with regard to such cultural fashions [such as intertextuality], but once we get wind of a new ‘method’ we are sure to pursue it relentlessly for all it is worth—and maybe then some” (“Forward to the English Edition,” in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga [Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009]), xi; Hays’s own *Echoes of Scripture* was among the earliest publications that took seriously the theoretical dimensions of intertextuality.

44 See chapter 1.

45 Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 16.

In light of the numerous examples he gives of Israel's sonship, Byrne is adamant that Paul is not drawing upon the Greco-Roman concept of adoption as the basis for his examples in Romans and Galatians, but rather he is using a well-established description of the relationship between YHWH and his people supplied by his Jewish background.⁴⁶

As I just noted, at its center, Byrne's attempt to construct a model and translation for the Pauline use of υιοθεσία solely from a Jewish background is grounded in an intertextual argument, though he does not explicitly express it as such.⁴⁷ However, through the course of his argument it is plain that Byrne's case rests on the assumption that the Jewish texts he cites as background for the Pauline use of υιοθεσία can be "added up" to equal its meaning in the Pauline text, without reference to its conventional meaning within the surrounding cultural context of Paul's audience. In his survey of Old Testament and intertestamental texts, Byrne includes a wide array of texts that describe Israel as "son," and although Byrne acknowledges that υιοθεσία does not, in fact, appear in *any* of the examples he cites, he maintains that υιοθεσία for Paul "expresses in a particularly apt way the status of Israel" that is seen in these texts.⁴⁸ As I will argue later, at least some of the texts Byrne cites as background are likely part of the underlying model for the υιοθεσία metaphors, particularly in Romans 9:4.⁴⁹ However, by filtering out the Greco-Roman models of adoption and the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία within Greco-Roman culture, Byrne's approach to intertextuality results in an idealized construction of a model and translation for υιοθεσία which only contains the "consistent pattern of thought" taken from his selection of Jewish texts.

Problematically, Byrne's approach thus necessitates that first-century Judaism existed in a vacuum rather than in a porous relationship to the Greco-Roman milieu in which it was situated. Moreover, Byrne's argument seems to make the *a priori* assumption that Paul could not have been borrowing a term from Greco-Roman culture, stating that studies relying on a Greek or Roman

46 Ibid., 216–20.

47 Again, since Byrne's study was published in 1979, before most biblical scholars began writing on methods of intertextual inquiry, it is understandable that Byrne makes these methodological assumptions without much discussion or defense of them in his monograph. However, the texts he proposes as the background for the Pauline uses of υιοθεσία (what I am terming "models") indeed provide a rich array of intertextual parallels, particularly in Romans 9:4, which is the locus of Byrne's exegesis. See chapter 7 below for further discussion.

48 Byrne, "Sons of God," 84; see also the discussion of Byrne's monograph in chapter 1 of this study.

49 See chapter 7 below.

background for υιοθεσία “fail to consider the possibility that Paul may not have had to search for a metaphor; that one may have been provided for him already by his Jewish background where Israel was seen as being in a relationship of sonship with respect to God.”⁵⁰ While it is most certainly true that Paul was familiar with the sonship motif in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, Walters points out, “Even if Paul sought to evoke Jewish expectations . . . he could not have removed himself from the Greco-Roman world.”⁵¹ However, if we recast Byrne’s intertextual argument as a reciprocal and dialogical relationship between texts rather than a one-directional process where precursor texts are added up to construct the meaning of successors, and if we grant that Paul, though he was a first-century Jew, existed within the larger framework of the Greco-Roman world, we are left with a more workable framework through which to consider the Jewish background Byrne proposes.

While Byrne is certainly right to read Paul in light of a Jewish background, his hermeneutical approach to the sonship texts as a background for υιοθεσία requires the following modifications. First, Byrne’s Jewish background texts certainly might inform the underlying model of the υιοθεσία metaphors, but they are also interanimated through the intertextual intersection of the Pauline texts.⁵² The interanimated intertextual relationship between the Pauline texts and precursory sonship texts must also consider the possibility of rereading background texts retrospectively through the Pauline lens of “adoption.” As I will show in my exegesis of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors, these interanimated intertextual relationships between precursory texts and the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors blend the categories of “Jewish sonship” and “Greco-Roman adoption” in the intertextual space.⁵³ Second, any analysis of metaphor must also account for the role of the audience as interpreters of the metaphor, which Byrne’s analysis largely neglects. As I argued previously,⁵⁴ in using a metaphor an author extends an invitation to the audience to view the metaphor’s tenor in light of its vehicle. By issuing this invitation, the author gives up control of spelling out exactly what features the vehicle of the metaphor highlights for the reader. Furthermore, because metaphors are indeterminate in their possible associations, and because intertextual relationships are likewise difficult to contain, it is unlikely that two audience members would produce precisely the same meaning for any given metaphor.

50 Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 81.

51 Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” 42.

52 See chapter 1 for a methodological discussion on intertextuality.

53 See chapter 7.

54 See chapter 3.

Because Byrne does not take into account the multivalent nature of intertextual relationships or the role Paul's audience played in the interpretation of the υιοθεσία metaphors, his account of a Jewish background and his translation "sonship" are inadequate for the Pauline contexts. In light of the numerous attestations of υιοθεσία surveyed above where it clearly means "adoption," and evidence which demonstrates that adoption was a well-known practice in the first century, Byrne's translation of "sonship" is on tenuous ground. In his attempt to demonstrate that Paul might have meant "sonship" rather than "adoption," he fails to consider that his case rests on all of the members of Paul's audience also understanding υιοθεσία to mean "sonship" and not "adoption." As Stanley Stowers observes, "Texts belong to languages and therefore also derive their meanings from the social practices rather than, say, the intentions in the heads of authors."⁵⁵ Although Byrne does succeed in demonstrating that the sonship of Israel is a common motif in Jewish literature,⁵⁶ his appeal to these texts cannot purge υιοθεσία of its conventional meaning "adoption" that is so widely attested in other extant first-century sources. It is highly unlikely that Paul's audience, upon hearing "υιοθεσία," associated Israel's "sonship" model and also *did not* associate the model "adopted sonship," as Byrne's translation would require. It is far more plausible and satisfying to see the Pauline metaphors and Byrne's sonship texts in a dialectic and interanimated relationship, mutually reinforcing one another for the members of the audience. The Jewish understanding of Israel as "son" has been taken up and recast by Paul as adoptive sonship, which indicates that despite the clear presence of intertextual connections the most appropriate translation of υιοθεσία in the Pauline contexts is still "adoption" or perhaps "adoption as sons."

However, it is important to note that Byrne's error does not lie in seeing the Jewish literature as background, but rather in allowing *only* these background texts to determine the translation "sonship." As I will show in the exegetical chapters, it is the combination of the interanimated background texts, Paul's distinctive contexts and usage of the υιοθεσία metaphors, and the conventional definition of υιοθεσία that create metaphorical meaning. As I argued in the previous chapter, one of the chief functions of a metaphor is to shape and influence the perception of the audience. Thus it is perfectly possible that Paul's use of υιοθεσία caused those in his audience familiar with the Jewish literature that Byrne cites to rethink the nature of the sonship described in those passages as specifically *adoptive* sonship, while at the same time recognizing that

55 Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 6–7.

56 Byrne's survey of sonship texts are not limited to the sonship of Israel, but include other categories such as "heavenly/angelic beings" and "royal sonship," (*"Sons of God,"* 9–78).

these texts likely informed Paul's choice to use υἱοθεσία as a metaphor.⁵⁷ This perspective emphasizes the dynamic and multivalent relationship between the Pauline metaphors and the Jewish texts. The Pauline metaphors have just as much potential for highlighting the adoptive aspect of Israel's sonship as the Jewish background of sonship did in aiding and influencing Paul's selection of an appropriate metaphor in the first place. Thus although below I will sketch the model from the Jewish background by considering texts from the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, when this model is juxtaposed with the Pauline metaphor in the exegetical chapters, I will also consider carefully whether the Pauline use "speaks back" in dialogue with these texts in the Jewish sonship tradition.

"Adoption" and a Jewish Background

Since the publication of Byrne's monograph there has been a steady trend to read the Pauline metaphors in light of a Jewish background, though a substantial number of scholars have rightly remarked that Byrne's translation of υἱοθεσία as "sonship" is problematic given the overwhelming evidence for "adoption" as the best translation for its conventional meaning. Of the recent studies published, Scott's monograph contains the most detailed and comprehensive analysis of the conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία in its first-century context. Scott concludes, "in the Hellenistic period υἱοθεσία always denotes 'adoption as son' and never merely, as commonly supposed, 'sonship.'"⁵⁸ Thus, unlike Byrne, Scott begins his exegesis of the Pauline texts using the best attested conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία, "adopted as son." Scott also recognizes that it is problematic that υἱοθεσία occurs nowhere in the LXX, though like Byrne, Scott desires to read Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in light of an exclusively Old Testament background. His solution to the absence of υἱοθεσία in the LXX is to argue for the concept of adoption being present even if the Greek word group is absent. To make his case, Scott relies on what he terms a "Hebrew adoption formula," especially as it appears in 2 Samuel 7:14, which reads "I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me" (אני אהיה־לו לאב והוא יהיה־לי לבן).⁵⁹ Scott argues strongly for seeing this "Hebrew adoption formula" and, more specifically, the

57 This notion will be more fully discussed in the analysis of Romans 9:4 in chapter 7.

58 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, xiv.

59 For similar arguments regarding Old Testament adoptions see Harald-Martin Wahl, "Ester, das adoptierte Waisenkind: Zur Adoption im Alten Testament," *Bib* 80.1 (1999): 78–99; see also Erhard Blum, "Psalm 2,7c—eine performative Aussage," in *Sefer Rendtorff: Festschrift zum 50sten Geburtstag von Rolf Rendtorff* (DBAT 1), ed. Konrad Rupprecht (Dielheim: Self-published by authors, 1975), 4–8.

adoption of the Davidic line in 2 Samuel 7:14, as the reference which underlies all of the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία. He states,

This understanding of υιοθεσία against the background of the 2 Sam 7:14 tradition provides the logical and necessary starting point for any further investigation of the sonship of believers in Paul; for “adoption” as a son of God provides the means of entry into divine sonship.⁶⁰

Though Scott's monograph is very thorough in its examination of biblical and extra-biblical material in the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, his assertion that “the sure conclusion that υιοθεσία... refers to a specific Old Testament Jewish background”⁶¹ misunderstands the complexities of both intertextuality and the role models play in the production of metaphorical meaning.

In contrast to Byrne's monograph, by starting with “adoption” as the appropriate translation, Scott's approach does account for the Hellenistic background for the semantic field that includes υιοθεσία and other related terms.⁶² However, what is rather puzzling about Scott's argument is his insistence that the meaning of υιοθεσία in the Pauline texts can be separated from the first-century practice of adoption that determines its conventional meaning, and that the background of its Pauline use can be restricted to a single Old Testament text. Since language is grounded in the social practices and shared activities of communities and societies,⁶³ it is unnatural and illogical for Scott to presuppose a background that does not include some of the key social practices and customs of the culture in which Paul's audience was situated. Furthermore, though Scott also attempts to find an intertextual link between the Pauline context and the Old Testament, he too does not adequately address the complexities of intertextuality in his methodological approach, as intertextual links need to be treated both diachronically and synchronically.⁶⁴ Scott's argument, focused as it is on the one-directional, diachronic relationship between 2 Samuel 7:14 and the Pauline occurrences of υιοθεσία, consequently

60 Ibid., 269.

61 Ibid., 265.

62 Scott remarks, “By the time of the New Testament, the semantic field of υιοθεσία comprised at least six word groups” (*Adoption as Sons*, 13) and he examines all of the terms in order to avoid what Barr terms “the over-concentration on the single word” (*Semantics of Biblical Language*, 235).

63 Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 6.

64 See chapter 2 for a detailed discussion on metaphor and intertextuality; see also Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6.

mates Paul's distinctive voice and vocabulary as a possible interpreter of the tradition Scott identifies.

Furthermore, Scott's argument fails to consider a metaphor's indeterminate nature or the role of the audience in his analysis. Even if the audience were to associate υιοθεσία as a model with 2 Samuel 7:14, it is unlikely that this would be done to the exclusion of all other associations and implications of the model. For example, a gentile member of Paul's audience familiar with the first-century Roman practice of adoption might associate implications such as: adoption as establishing kinship apart from birth, adoption as a transfer from outside the family to inside the family, adoption guaranteeing inheritance, adoption perpetuating the *genius* of the *paterfamilias*, adoption as the means by which Imperial power was transferred, which are consistent with Greek and Roman practices, but none of which are necessarily present in 2 Samuel 7:14.⁶⁵ Thus, in order for Scott's analysis to be plausible, Paul would somehow have had to ensure that his audience members considered only those implications derived from 2 Samuel 7:14. Since the evidence surveyed above shows that υιοθεσία was a fairly widespread practice in the first century, it was also probably a fixed and indelible image in the minds of the audience, and this image is unlikely to have been entirely overshadowed by a single Old Testament text when their minds constructed a mental simulation of υιοθεσία. Moreover, because there is no explicit reference or quotation of 2 Samuel 7:14 in any of the Pauline occurrences, it is unlikely that, as Scott maintains "by ignoring this methodological starting point, Pauline studies currently labors under some confusion about the subject of divine sonship."⁶⁶ On the contrary, perhaps all Scott is able to conclude from his study is that the adoption of the Davidic line in 2 Samuel 7:14 is present as *one* of the possible models of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors. Indeed, for some audience members it may not have been accessible at all.

Summary: Model, Background, Intertextuality and the Role of the Audience

A few final remarks must be said here about the relationship between the underlying model and the role of the audience in the production of metaphorical meaning before examining specific models in the following section. Previous chapters have emphasized that metaphors are not wholly determinate in their meaning, and this is largely due to the role the audience plays in fleshing out the various implications of metaphorical meaning. Likewise, where more than one possible model exists it is impossible to rule out a

65 These implications will be discussed below.

66 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 270.

particular model on the basis of supposed authorial intention since the author is but one part of the communicative act. Furthermore, given the possible backgrounds of υιοθεσία and the cultural milieu of the recipients of Paul's letters, it is even feasible that elements from each model would have existed alongside one another within an individual's mental simulation. Therefore, no one background can be proposed to the exclusion of others. Moreover, within intertextual relationships, each act of interpretation can transform both precursor and successor texts for the interpreter, and thus we must also allow for the possibility of the backgrounds mutually informing and transforming one another for the audience members. Although the possible backgrounds will be treated separately below, they are by no means intended as exclusive alternatives. Rather, as "texts," broadly defined, the different backgrounds would likely have been interwoven to create a multivalent and complex underlying model for Paul's υιοθεσία metaphors in the minds of his audience.

Possible Models for υιοθεσία

Jewish Background

The presence of other Old Testament allusions and quotations in Romans and Galatians (e.g., references to Abraham [Rom 4:1–25; Gal 3:6–9, 16–18], to Sarah [Rom 4:19; 9:9; Gal 4:21–31], and Hagar [Gal 4:21–31], the giving of the law [Rom 9:4; Gal 3:17–21], etc.) suggests that Paul assumed that his audience was at least familiar with a Jewish framework, that he himself was likely operating under a Jewish framework (though not exclusively so), and moreover the possibility exists that there were some Jewish believers present in his audience. Therefore, it is likely that at least some of the audience members would have recalled and drawn upon the Jewish tradition of sonship for their "consistent imaginative construct" underlying the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts. The Old Testament designation of Israel as the son of YHWH is perhaps most salient in Romans 9:4, which lists υιοθεσία among the privileges of Israel, and thus this occurrence especially demands careful attention to the intertextual relationships between the Pauline text and other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition.⁶⁷ However, it also must be emphasized at the outset that the Jewish background cannot be neatly separated from the Greek and Roman backgrounds, nor can υιοθεσία be emptied of its conventional meaning as a term for adoption. Rather, the Jewish tradition of the sonship of Israel and the Israelites

67 These texts and the intertextual connections will be treated thoroughly in chapter 7.

both informs the metaphor and is itself informed by the Greek and Roman adoption practices when these models collide in the intertextual space.

As I have shown above, the Jewish texts which may underlie the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts constitute the least straightforward of the possible models, and furthermore they require interpreters to carefully consider the intertextual relationships between the Pauline texts and precursory texts. This is especially true given that the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία denotes “adoption,” and that Hebrew lacks a functional equivalent to υιοθεσία.⁶⁸ Moreover, because each occurrence of the Pauline metaphor evokes different intertextual relationships I will restrict the preliminary discussion below to a brief and succinct mention of several of the most relevant texts in order to provide a rough “sketch” of the Jewish model underlying the υιοθεσία metaphors in the Pauline texts.

It is striking that by the first century Greek and Roman adoption practices were sufficiently well known by Jewish writers that they began to use the semantic field of υιοθεσία to describe Moses’s situation with Pharaoh’s daughter in Exodus 2:10. For example, Philo writes τελειότερον δὲ τῆς ἡλικίας ἰδοῦσα κάκ τῆς ὄψεως ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον σπάσασα εὐνοίας υἱὸν ποιεῖται τὰ περὶ τὸν ὄγκον τῆς γαστρὸς τεχνάσασα πρότερον, ἵνα γνήσιος ἀλλὰ μὴ ὑποβολιμαῖος νομισθῇ (And the princess, seeing him so advanced beyond his age, conceived for him an even greater fondness than before, and took [adopted] him for her son, having at an earlier time artificially enlarged the figure of her womb to make him pass as her real and not a supposititious child) (*Mos.* 1.19).⁶⁹ Similarly, Josephus writes, “Ὅντα δ’ αὐτὸν τοιοῦτον ἢ Θέρμουθις παῖδα ποιεῖται (Such was the child whom Thermuthis adopted as her son) (*Ant.* 2.232)⁷⁰ indicating that he also found terms from the semantic domain of adoption to be an appropriate label for Moses’s situation in Exodus. In addition, the Greek translation of Jubilees labels Moses’s case an adoption (βασιλίδι οὔσῃ εἰσποιηθεὶς) (*Jub.* 47.5). Josephus also designates Lot as Abram’s adopted son, using the phrase “Ἀβραμὸς δὲ Λῶτον τὸν Ἀράνου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ υἱὸν τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Σάρρας ἀδελφὸν εἰσεποίησατο γνησίου παιδὸς ἀπορῶν (Now Abraham, having no legitimate son, adopted Lot, his brother Aran’s son and the brother of his wife Sarra) (*Ant.* 1.154).⁷¹ These

68 Scott recognizes this too, but states that “it is necessary to distinguish between the meaning of a term and its background in any particular context. Since, in the final analysis, the context indicates what kind of adoption is in view, Paul’s concept of adoption could be based on an Old Testament/Jewish background” (*Adoption as Sons*, 61).

69 Philo, *Mos.* 1.19 (LCL, trans. F. H. Colson).

70 Josephus, *Ant.* 2.232 (LCL, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray).

71 Josephus, *Ant.* 1.154 (LCL, trans. Thackeray).

examples suggest that the use of the Greek adoption terminology to denote artificially established kinship between human parents and children might have been fairly prevalent within first-century Judaism.

However, it is anachronistic to claim, as Scott does, that these examples demonstrate a Jewish concept of adoption in the original texts. Exodus 2:10 reads *ויגדל הילד ותבאָהוּ לבת־פרעה ויהי־לָהּ לִבֵּן*, which is best translated “when the child grew up she brought him to Pharaoh’s daughter and he became a son to her.” Though something like an adoptive relationship might be implied in the text, it is very difficult to assert that the earliest readers of Exodus 2:10 would have labeled it as such, given that the Old Testament law lacks evidence for the institution of legal adoption, and that it maintains a consistent emphasis on the perpetuation of patrilineal descent in the case of orphans and widows (e.g., Gen 38:8; Deut 25:5–6, 9–10; Ruth 4:17). Rather, we see in Josephus and Philo a similar situation to the Pauline uses of *υιοθεσία*. Namely, Paul, Philo, and Josephus have all appropriated Hellenistic terms and used them to describe earlier Jewish texts. Thus, in these examples Hellenistic and Hebraic influences cannot be neatly separated.

Given that several first-century Jewish authors felt free to utilize the semantic domain of adoption to describe the relationships between humans in Old Testament texts, the pertinent question for the purpose of exegeting the Pauline metaphors is how *υιοθεσία* connects to the Old Testament texts where Israel or the Davidide are named the son of YHWH. Although it is unlikely that the first readers or authors of the Old Testament would have seen Israel’s sonship or the Davidide’s sonship as adoptive sonship specifically, the texts cited above suggest that it is more probable first-century readers might have interpreted these textual traditions in light of adoption. For example, there are numerous metaphorical references to the sonship of Israel in the Old Testament, and presumably it is this tradition that Paul labels *υιοθεσία* in Romans 9:4.⁷² If we take a synchronic approach to the construction of the underlying model, then it is perfectly plausible to suggest that the first-century “text” of the cultural practice of *υιοθεσία* speaks to the Old Testament texts that identify Israel as YHWH’s son, forming a new tradition of Israel as the adopted son of YHWH for the Pauline audience that was familiar with these precursory texts.

Taking into account the synchronic nature of intertextuality, some of the relevant texts for constructing the model for *υιοθεσία* in its Pauline occurrences might include texts such as Exodus 4:22; 2 Samuel 7:14; Psalm 2:7; Deuteronomy 8:5; Deuteronomy 14:1; Proverbs 3:11–12; Isaiah 43:6–7; Jeremiah

72 Much more will be said about Israelite sonship and Romans 9:4 in chapter 7.

31:9; Hosea 2:1 [MT]; and Malachi 3:17.⁷³ The sonship in 2 Samuel 7:14 (אני אהיה־לו לאב והוא יהיה־לי לבן/I will be a Father to him and he will be a son to me) and Psalm 2:7 (אני ילדתיך/you are my son, today I have begotten you) is extended not to Israel as a collective, but to the successor of the Davidic monarchy specifically. However, Scott suggests that the Davidide's sonship is "subsumed under the covenant with Israel."⁷⁴ Scott continues, "[I]f the עם of Yahweh are the בנים of God, then the reciprocal covenant relationship between Yahweh as the God of Israel and Israel as the עם of Yahweh embraces the reciprocal relationship between Yahweh as the Father of the Davidide and the Davidide as the בן of God."⁷⁵ Israel's collective sonship is in view in Exodus 4:22 (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה בְּנִי בְכֹרִי יִשְׂרָאֵל/Thus says the LORD, Israel is my firstborn son), and YHWH compares his discipline of Israel to that of a father and son in Deuteronomy 8:5 (יָדַעַתָּ עַם־לִבְבְּךָ כִּי כֹאשֶׁר יִיסַר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ/Know then in your heart that as a man disciplines his son, so the LORD your God disciplines you), and in Proverbs 3:12 (כִּי אֵת אֲשֶׁר יֶאֱהָב יְהוָה/the LORD reproves the one he loves as a father the son in whom he delights). Likewise Malachi 3:17 (see also Mal 1:6) does not specifically reference Israel as "son," but it is implicit in the comparison made in the text (אֲנִי אֶחַסְדָּם כֹּאשֶׁר יַחְמֵל אִישׁ עַל־בְּנוֹ הַעֲבָד אֹתוֹ/I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him).

Often the collective sonship of Israel is found in passages that contain a rebuke because they have forgotten YHWH as their Father and Creator (Isa 43:6–7; Mal 2:10). This rebuke is most prominently seen in Deuteronomy 32:5–6, which reads

שַׁחַת לֹא בָנוּ מוֹמָם דּוֹר עֶקֶשׁ וּפְתָלָתַל
הִלִּיחוּ תַגְמְלוּ־זֹאת עִם נָבֵל וְלֹא חֲכָם
הִלּוּ־הוּא אֲבִיד קִנָּה הוּא עֶשֶׂךְ וִיכַנְנֶךָ

They are corrupt and not his sons, to their shame they are a warped and crooked generation. Is this the way you repay the LORD, you foolish and unwise people? Is he not your Father, your Creator, who made you and formed you?

73 Trevor Burke adds Deut 1:31 and Hos 11 in his list of paradigmatic sonship texts, however the imagery in these passages is of a mother and son, and thus is not a direct parallel of the Father-son relationship Paul invokes in Romans and Galatians (*The Message of Sonship: At Home in God's Household* [Downers Grove: IVP, 2011], 53–68; 81–99).

74 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 99.

75 Ibid.

In addition, several Old Testament texts closely link Israel's sonship with their salvation from YHWH their father (e.g., Isa 63:16; Jer 31:9). Though this list of texts is by no means exhaustive, the diversity of the list demonstrates that sonship is one of the Old Testament descriptions of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH. As Byrne remarks, in the context of the covenant with Israel sonship adds "a special element of intimacy" and "a demand for acknowledgement."⁷⁶ Consequently, much more will be said about the relationship between YHWH's covenant with Israel and the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors in the exegetical chapters.

The Jewish sonship tradition also appears in various forms and with various emphases in the intertestamental literature (e.g., Wis 12:19–22; 18:1–4; Sirach 36:16–17; Jdt 9:12–14; Jos. Asen. 19.8; 3 Macc 6.27–28; 7.6; Pss. Sol. 17.26–29). As in the Old Testament texts mentioned above, the sonship references in the intertestamental literature retain a degree of fluidity between designating the collective of Israel as "son" and also naming individuals among the Israelites "sons of God." For example, Sirach 51:10 contains a passage that is remarkably similar to Romans 8:15 and Galatians 4:6 where an individual is calling upon God as Father. Sirach 51:10 reads ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου μή με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλίψεως (I called upon the LORD, Father of my LORD, do not forsake me in the days of distress) However in Sirach 36:11 (LXX) Israel as a whole is designated the πρωτόγονος (firstborn) of the LORD.

Moreover, Sirach 36:11 also highlights the fact that the precursory texts do not always rely on precisely the same underlying "sonship" model; some texts use the more general terms "son" or "sons," and some use the more specific "firstborn" (e.g., Wis 18:13; Sir 36:16; Pss. Sol. 18.4; Jub. 19.29). Despite the differences in terminology, this need not mean that these texts should be excluded from consideration. Rather, in sketching the model for the Pauline texts the various designations (υιοθεσία, πρωτότοκος/πρωτόγονος, υἱός) must sit alongside one another, and Paul's unique use of υιοθεσία must be allowed to speak back to the texts in the sonship tradition. While it is clear that the intertestamental literature continues the Old Testament sonship traditions, it must be emphatically stated that the Jewish background cannot be considered in isolation from the conventional meaning of υιοθεσία in its first-century cultural context, nor can one view this tradition as background for the Pauline use of υιοθεσία without also considering Paul's interpretation of it. Rather, both the Jewish "sonship" and "firstborn son" models must sit alongside the "adoption" models from the Greco-Roman sources, each speaking its own voice to Paul's reader.

⁷⁶ Byrne, "Sons of God," 16.

Greek Background

Above I discussed the lexical evidence for words in the same semantic domain as υἱοθεσία, and the evidence discussed was drawn from both Greek and Roman legal sources detailing specific practices of adoption and epigraphical evidence which attested to the adopted status of various individuals. The purpose above was to determine the appropriate translation and conventional meaning of υἱοθεσία, and here the task is to examine several of the pertinent underlying cultural assumptions that are latent in the evidence for Greek and Roman adoption practices in order to provide a fuller sketch of the Greek and Roman models of adoption. Unlike Jewish culture, Greek culture did have a formal institution of adoption. Early evidence for Greek adoption, largely found in sources dated prior to the fourth century BCE, demonstrates that “adoption was widely recognized as a legitimate means of refiguring kinship structures.”⁷⁷ Although some have argued that Greek practices of adoption were in decline by as early as the fourth century BCE,⁷⁸ recent interpretations of the epigraphical evidence from Hellenistic Athens have suggested a higher degree of continuity between adoption practices in Hellenistic and Roman Athens. For example, Lene Rubinstein et al. argue, “[I]t is not reasonable to assume that the Athenian institution of adoption had disappeared at some stage between the end of the fourth century and the mid-second century BC (the period for which we have no sources!) only to reappear in a Roman guise at this point.”⁷⁹ The literary evidence for Greek adoption shows that it was used primarily for a father to secure an heir to manage the destiny of his οἶκος, and inheritance is a prominent theme in the speeches of Isaeus and Demosthenes. Although few sure conclusions can be drawn from the epigraphical evidence from the second century BCE, “There is no apparent reason to believe that it [adoption] had changed drastically from the institution which is described in the forensic speeches of the Attic orators.”⁸⁰ Significantly, the texts that describe Greek adoption share common themes, such as lineage and inheritance, with the Pauline metaphors. These common affinities likely point to the presence of shared values that underlie both Greek and Roman practices of adoption, and continued through the first century when Paul penned his metaphors.

The evidence in legal sources is sufficiently scant and varied that it is unwise to speak of a univocal concept of “Greek adoption,” but rather evidence for

77 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 29.

78 Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 89.

79 Lene Rubinstein (et al.), “Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens,” *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991): 142.

80 Ibid.

various practices of Greek adoption.⁸¹ Our source of knowledge regarding the Greek legal practice of adoption comes almost entirely from the orations of Isaeus and Demosthenes. Though the legal evidence for the specific practices and procedures for Greek adoptions is lacking, the speeches of Isaeus and Demosthenes provide us with an interesting perspective on the social and cultural norms regarding adopted fathers and sons. However, it should be noted that Isaeus and Demosthenes preserve cases where adoption is being disputed. Their usefulness is therefore not that they demonstrate the legal customs of adoption, but rather lies in examining what norms and values they appeal to in the course of their arguments regarding the disputed adoptions. In their writings it becomes clear that the primary function of Greek adoption was to provide an heir to take over the estate, to pass along an inheritance, and to secure care for an adoptive father in his old age.⁸²

There were three types of adoption recorded in Greek sources: testamentary adoption, posthumous adoption, and adoption *inter vivos*. Testamentary adoptions and posthumous adoptions occur most frequently, whereby a father named and adopted a son in his will (testamentary adoption) or left the selection of a son to his family upon his death (posthumous adoption).⁸³ Though there are more cases of testamentary and posthumous adoptions in the relevant Athenian sources, this is likely because adoption *inter vivos* was much harder to contest. In cases of *inter vivos* adoption, the adopted son had the same legal rights as a natural son, and entered the family while his adoptive father was still living (Isaeus 6.63). According to Isaeus, a son was adopted *inter vivos* by presenting him for public enrollment in a deme or phratry, which was a way for both natural and adoptive fathers to secure citizenship and inheritance rights for such sons (εἰ τις αὐτὸς ζῶν καὶ εὖ φρονῶν ἐποίησατο καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀγαγὼν εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἀπέδειξε καὶ εἰς τὰ κοινὰ γραμματεῖα ἐνέγραψεν/ after he [the living adopter] has led his adopted son to the domestic shrines and presented him to his kindred and inscribed him in the official registers [Isaeus 7.1]). It is also striking that Greek adoption is not merely a legal way of securing an heir, but that the legal practice is inextricably linked with household religious practice. Entering the οἶκος of an adoptive father also entailed an adoptive son's commitment to the household gods of the adoptive father,

81 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 29.

82 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 4; see also Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 90–91.

83 Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” 47; for a more complete analysis of the Greek sources, see Lene Rubinstein, *Adoption in IV. Century Athens* (Opuscula Graecolatina 34, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1993, 117–25).

and this trend continued in Roman practices of adoption.⁸⁴ However, Walters notes, “Because a son adopted *inter vivos* retained his right to a share of the father’s inheritance even if the father produced natural heirs following the adoption, this form of adoption was probably unpopular with men until they were advanced in years.”⁸⁵

Greek law seems to have had several stipulations on adoption, including that the adoptive father must be in possession of his mental faculties, not under the influence of drugs or disease, free from the influence of a woman, and not under constraint or deprived of liberty (ἄν μὴ μανιῶν ἢ γήρως ἢ φαρμάκων ἢ νόσου ἔνεκα, ἢ γυναικὶ πειθόμενος, ὑπὸ τούτων του παρανοῶν, ἢ ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης ἢ ὑπὸ δεσμοῦ καταληφθεὶς [Dem 46:14]). The most pertinent difference from Roman conventions includes the stipulation in Greek law that a father could not adopt if he already had a legal heir. Such a stipulation shows how closely the concepts of adoption and inheritance were linked in Greek social norms. This law, cited by Demosthenes reads,

Any citizen . . . shall have the right to dispose of his own property by will as he shall see fit, if he have no male children lawfully born (ἄν μὴ παῖδες ὦσι γνήσιοι ἄρρενες).⁸⁶

There are several other distinctive features of Greek adoption that are not found in its Roman counterpart. Interestingly, the cases reported by Isaeus and Demosthenes suggest that Greek adoption did not require the severing of all original familial ties, which is further confirmed by later epigraphical evidence of epitaphs, private dedications, and various lists of priests and archons that preserve the patronymics of both the adoptive and natural father of a son.⁸⁷ Most notably, in Greek adoption an adopted son retained his connection to his

84 Plato encourages fathers to be virtuous models for their children by saying, “By paying honour and reverence to his kinsfolk, and all who share in the worship of the tribal gods and are sprung from the same blood, a man will, in proportion to his piety, secure the goodwill of the gods of Birth to bless his own begetting of children (ξυγένειαν δὲ καὶ ὁμογνίαν θεῶν κοινωνίαν ἅπασαν ταῦτοῦ φύσιν αἵματος ἔχουσαν τιμῶν τις καὶ σεβόμενος εὖνους ἄν γενηθλίους θεοῦς εἰς παίδων αὐτοῦ σποράν ἴσχοι κατὰ λόγον)” Plato, *Laws* 5.792c (LCL, trans. R. G. Bury).

85 Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” 47.

86 Demosthenes, *Private Orations*, XLI–XLIX, 46.14 (trans. Murray, LCL).

87 See, e.g., *IG II²* 7691; 2992; 1717; see also Rubinstein, “Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens,” 149–51 for a helpful chart of the epigraphical evidence.

natural mother (Isaeus, 7.25).⁸⁸ Furthermore, A. R. W. Harrison states that “an adoptee had the right to return to the house of his natural father if he left a son of his body in the house of his adoptive father,” citing Isaeus 6.44 (ὁ γὰρ νόμος οὐκ ἐὰ ἐπανιέναι, ἐὰν μὴ ὅν καταλίπη γνήσιον/For the law does not allow the return of an adoptive son to his original family, unless he leaves a legitimate son in the family which he quits).⁸⁹ There also was some distinction within Greek practices between the adopted and natural children in terms of the future of the οἶκος.⁹⁰ Though it seems foreign to Western sensibilities regarding adoption, if the adopted son failed to produce natural-born heirs for the οἶκος, then he forfeited his rights to inheritance as the adopted son.⁹¹ These features of Greek adoption further emphasize the close connection between adoption and inheritance in Greek culture, but I will show in the exegetical chapters that it is difficult to reconcile some of the specific practices of Greek adoption with the flow of Paul’s argument in Galatians and Romans.⁹² However, given that there are always parts of an underlying model that do not figure in the formation of metaphorical meaning, it should not trouble us that there are aspects of the Greek practices that do not seem to fit with Paul’s examples. On the contrary, it is enough to conclude that since both the examples from Isaeus and Demosthenes and the Pauline texts connect adoption with inheritance that they likely are drawing on a shared and common cultural belief that one of the purposes of adoption was to secure an heir.

Roman Background

Because the epigraphical evidence does not present a clear-cut picture of “Greek adoption” and “Roman adoption” it is difficult to delineate precise boundaries around “Greek practices” and “Roman practices.” Moreover, epigraphical evidence indicates that adoptions continued to be fairly common occurrences during the Roman period. However, the Roman legal sources describe a slightly different set of cultural values. Furthermore, there is considerable continuity between the earliest Roman legal sources and later sources such as the law codes of Gaius and Justinian, suggesting that the ideology driving the legal

88 For a full discussion of the specific legal provisions governing Athenian adoption see A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 82–96.

89 Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 94; Isaeus 6.44 (LCL trans. Forster).

90 See Rubinstein, “Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens,” 146–51; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 93.

91 Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 85–86.

92 See especially the discussions in chapter 5 and chapter 6.

practice of adoption remained more or less constant over the course of several centuries. However, some of the examples below will also show that in some cases there are large discrepancies between the descriptions of adoption in legal documents and the practice as it was carried out throughout the empire.

Because Paul's audiences are located in Roman contexts during the Imperial period,⁹³ and, as I will discuss in more detail below, because emperors in the first century used highly publicized adoptions as a means of transferring power, I contend that Paul's audiences in both Rome and Galatia were almost certainly familiar with the conventions of Roman adoption. In order to provide a framework through which to understand the social, political, and religious conventions at play in Roman adoption, it is necessary to begin with a brief overview of the various legal practices of adoption. As Lewis rightly points out, it is not enough to examine only the legal practices of Roman adoption, as if these can be divorced from the underlying social, political, and religious values.⁹⁴ Instead, all of these factors must be weighed in order to best understand the features of Roman adoption that Paul's audience would most likely have associated with the uses of *υιοθεσία* metaphors in his letters.

Adoption in Roman society served similar purposes to Greek adoption, chief among them being securing a suitable heir for an estate. In Roman households, adoption was a vital method for preserving the distinct and peculiar role of fathers and sons within the *familia*; in a Roman household, every family member was under the *patria potestas* or "paternal power" of the eldest male of the family.⁹⁵ It is difficult for contemporary Western readers to comprehend some of the peculiarities of the Roman *familia*, and none is more foreign to contemporary Western sensibilities than the power of the *paterfamilias*. The *paterfamilias* of a Roman *familia* had "the power of life and death (*utique ei uitae necisque in eum potestas* [Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 5.19.9])" over his estate, which included his wife, children, and slaves, though this power was usually used to exert authority over the management of the household rather than to exercise his paternal authority over more extreme situations, such as the exposure of infants.⁹⁶ Under Roman law a *paterfamilias* had the right to arrange and

93 The specific settings of Galatians and Romans will be discussed in more detail in the exegetical chapters.

94 See Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption,"* 181–83.

95 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50.

96 See *Ibid.*, 50–51; Emiel Eyben, "Fathers and Sons," in *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 106–43; Richard Saller, "*Patria Potestas* and the Stereotype of the Roman Family," *Continuity and Change* 1 (1986): 7–22.

approve the marriages of his children, sell his sons (though not his daughters) or bind them to a creditor, adopt his sons into another family, and expose his infant children.⁹⁷ He retained this power until his death, so even his grown sons were *in potestate* until the death of their father. In theory a Roman father held absolute authority over his family (Gaius, *Inst.* 1.55), but in practice the primary responsibility of the *paterfamilias* was the management of the estate's goods. This role required the *paterfamilias* to ensure the preservation of the family's wealth, status, honor, and cult. Adoption provided the *paterfamilias* with an avenue to preserve the family's inheritable goods through the exercise of his *potestas* to make a son for himself by decree.⁹⁸ Peppard notes that adoption

was not enacted to stabilize the life of a child, but to stabilize the future of a father. . . . Roman adoption, as with most other Roman family relations, was unusually focused on the *paterfamilias*. At issue were his name, his wealth, his status, and his sacred rites; without a son, his divine spirit (*genius*) would perish. One could say that all laws led to the Roman father.⁹⁹

Therefore, because of the Roman "readiness to extend relationships,"¹⁰⁰ adoption was often the most expedient means by which a *paterfamilias* (usually childless) could ensure the preservation of the inheritable goods of his *familia*. Thus it is unsurprising to find that discussions regarding inheritance and the transmission of power figure prominently in the Roman legal sources pertaining to adoption.

Because the estate rested on the *potestas* of the *paterfamilias*, the primary purpose of Roman adoption was for the *paterfamilias* to be able to pass on his *potestas* to a suitable heir upon his death.¹⁰¹ In order to adopt under Roman law, one had to possess *potestas* and be legally independent (*sui iuris*). A natural

97 Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 40.

98 Peppard remarks of Roman testamentary adoptions, "one can behold in them the potency of the Roman *paterfamilias*: he could sire children even from beyond the grave" (*The Son of God*, 59).

99 Ibid., 60.

100 Dixon, *The Roman Family*, 162.

101 Marek Kurylowicz, *Die Adoptio im klassischen römischen Recht* (Studia Antiqua, Warsaw: University of Warszawskieigo, 1981), 50; there are also numerous secondary motives for both giving and receiving sons in Roman adoption including: political maneuvering, alleviating the financial burden of a natural family raising a child, releasing a child from the overwhelming debt of an estate, etc.

consequence of adoption being the right of the *paterfamilias* is that Roman women could not adopt because they could not possess *potestas*. Neither did the wife of the adoptive *paterfamilias* enter into the relationship of “mother” to an adopted son. Justinian records that, “if I adopt a son, my wife does not occupy the place of a mother to him” (*Dig.* 1.7.23).¹⁰² However, adoption did enact any agnatic relationships that are a natural extension of the father-son relationship, thus the adoptee became the legal brother (or sister in rare cases) to any other children of the *paterfamilias* (*Dig.* 1.7.23). Furthermore, adoption was meant to “imitate nature”¹⁰³ and therefore it was clearly expected that the adopted son was to be younger than his adoptive *paterfamilias*.¹⁰⁴ Justinian records the conventional age gap between the adoptive *paterfamilias* and the adoptee as eighteen years, or “a full term of puberty” (*Inst. Iust.* 1.11.4).¹⁰⁵ A further consequence of adoption imitating nature is that an adoptive son was not able to renounce his adoption or the *potestas* of his adoptive *paterfamilias*, and remained *in potestate* until the death of the *paterfamilias* just like a natural son (Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 5.19).¹⁰⁶

There were two major types of adoption under Roman law: *adrogatio* and *adoptio*.¹⁰⁷ These two types differed in that an *adrogatio* adoption involved the adoption of a son who was already *sui iuris*, whereas an *adoptio* involved the adoption of a son who was under the *potestas* of another *paterfamilias*.¹⁰⁸ The procedure governing *adrogatio* adoptions was much more cumbersome than the procedure for *adoptio*, and because *adrogatio* extinguished a *familia*, they were probably never very common.¹⁰⁹ Since *adrogatio* involved the adoption of one *paterfamilias* by another, it meant that the adoptee surrendered his *potestas* over his inheritable goods (wealth, family, honor, and cult) and came under the *potestas* of his adopted *paterfamilias*. The key to understanding the gravity of extinguishing a *familia* lies in the religious component of the Roman household. The *paterfamilias* of a family was charged with pre-

102 “et ideo si filium adoptavero, uxor mea illi matris loco non est.”

103 “adoptio enim naturam imitator” (*Inst. Iust.* 1.11.4).

104 A notable exception was Clodius, who adopted a plebeian *older* than he, which shows that the aristocrats did not always abide by the rules they enacted (Cicero, *Dom.* 34–38).

105 “debet itaque is qui sibi per adrogationem vel adoptionem filium facit, plena pubertate, id est decem et octo annis praecedere.”

106 “utique ei vitae necisque in eum potestas siet, uti patri endo filio est.”

107 Though the formal legal code distinguishes between these two types of adoption, the terminology for adoption in other sources is much less precise and *ad hoc*; see also Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 14.

108 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 86.

109 Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” 53.

serving the family cult, and an adoptee, as the heir apparent, was expected to carry out the worship of the *genius* of his adopted family. If the adoptee was already *sui iuris*, then his adoption extinguished his own family cult at the expense of maintaining the cult of his adoptive *familia*. Lewis notes, “In the *domus*, the worship of the *genius* insures the succession of the family.”¹¹⁰ Moreover, Gellius records that especially in cases of *adrogatio* adoption the court must also consider whether the adopter is suited to having natural children and whether the property and wealth of the adoptee is being sought under false pretenses (*Attic Nights* 5.19.5–6). Because *adrogatio* meant the dissolution of a *familia* along with its *sacra*, the procedure required an inquiry by the college of pontiffs and the approval of the adoption by formal vote of a *comitia curiata* in Rome.¹¹¹ Thus the cumbersome legal procedures surrounding *adrogatio* adoptions gives us a glimpse into the importance of household religion within Roman society.

In contrast to *adrogatio*, *adoptio* was a private transaction between the natural *paterfamilias* and the adoptive *paterfamilias* of a son who was *homo alieni iuris*. The procedure for *adoptio* involved the natural *paterfamilias* selling his son into slavery to another party three times, and having the other party manumit the son after each time he was sold. Roman law returned sons to the authority of the *paterfamilias* the first two times they were manumitted, but after the third sale the father's *potestas* over his son was broken.¹¹² Once the natural father's *potestas* was broken, the adoptee came under the *potestas* of the adoptive *paterfamilias* by the decree of the magistrate. Scott remarks, “*adoptio sensu stricto* was a secular and relatively private matter involving only one individual as the object of adoption”¹¹³ and therefore in contrast to *adrogatio*, “*adoptio* could take place anywhere a magistrate was available.”¹¹⁴

What the two forms of Roman adoption as described in legal sources share in common is the removal of a son from one family and his permanent placement under the authority of a new *paterfamilias*. Although adoption could be a means of upward social mobility, it is more likely that the social circle of the son's natural family and adopted family was fairly homogeneous.¹¹⁵ However, despite that adoption usually involved a relatively lateral social move, adop-

110 Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption,"* 75.

111 Ibid.

112 The Twelve Tables records “*si pater ter filium venum duit, filius a patre liber esto* (if father thrice surrender his son for sale, son shall be free from father) [4.2. LCL].”

113 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 12.

114 Ibid.

115 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 294.

tion did have several substantial benefits for the adopted son, including the cancellation of any outstanding debts and acquiring the status of his new *familia*. Furthermore, within the Roman *familia* there was no distinction in status between natural sons and adoptive sons.¹¹⁶ Gaius records, "Adoptive sons in their adoptive family are in the same legal position as real sons" (*Inst.* 2.136),¹¹⁷ and also "as long as they remain in the adoptive *familia*, they are considered strangers so far as their natural father is concerned (*Inst.* 2.137)."¹¹⁸ It is clear from both literary and epigraphic evidence that the Romans considered adoption as a practical means for providing a legal and socially-accepted stand-in for a natural son, which allowed Roman families to maintain their lineages and secure the future of the *familia*.¹¹⁹ At its heart, the institution of Roman adoption was a calculating way for the *paterfamilias* to ensure the preservation of his *gens* and for an adoptee to advance his wealth and status; it left little room for sentimentality. Seneca advises young men who have been requested for adoption to be prudent about agreeing to the arrangement, stating, "If [this young man] wants to go, he should inquire how many ancestors the old man who seeks him has, what rank they are, what the old man's wealth is" (1.6.6).¹²⁰ While Roman practices may lack the sentimentality of the contemporary concept of adoption, they were nevertheless a powerful means of restructuring identity, status, and wealth, and they afforded Roman fathers and sons a "remedy for chance"¹²¹ to alter the natural course of both individual and familial destinies.

The Roman legal practices of adoption do not necessarily reflect the complex social realities that surrounded the Roman institution. Rather, the form of adoption preserved in Roman law is the "ideal form," which also reflects an idealized form of the Roman *familia* and of society.¹²² However, it is not at all clear that most adoptions adhered to this ideal. Indeed, the extant papyri and epigraphical evidence "demonstrate the diversity of terminology and ideas involved."¹²³ Thus, the legal sources often do not exactly align with other docu-

116 Note also that there was no legal provision restricting adopted sons from adopting their heirs in Roman law as there was in Greek law.

117 "*Adoptiui filii, quamdiu manent in adoptione, naturalium loco sunt.*"

118 "*Qua ratione accidit, ut ex diuerso, quod ad naturalem parentem pertinet, quamdiu quidem sint in adoptiua familia, extraneorum numero habeantur.*"

119 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 31.

120 "*Si volet ire, quaerat senex ille qui petit quales et quot habeat maiores, quanta bona, an satis magno se possit addicere.*"

121 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 57.

122 Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 295.

123 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 58.

mentary evidence where instances of “common law” adoptions are recorded. These “common law” adoptions often flouted the legal regulations set down by the law codes,¹²⁴ but these adoptions “not legally made” could be later confirmed by the emperor (*Dig.* 1.7.38).

Practically speaking, adoption was often a means not only of securing an heir to whom a father would eventually pass his *patria potestas*, but also was used to form alliances between families or to secure, consolidate, or transfer political power.¹²⁵ The most prominent examples of adoption as a tool for the transfer of power are undoubtedly the adoptions of Roman emperors. Indeed, Lewis claims that Octavian’s testamentary adoption by Julius Caesar was “the most significant adoption in all of human history,”¹²⁶ and it made Octavian *divi filius* or “son of a god.” As the adopted son of Julius Caesar who was charged with the task of maintaining his *genius*, Octavian built temples, made inscriptions, and gave sacrifices in honor of the *genius* of Julius Caesar.¹²⁷ Moreover, eventually Augustus decreed that a libation be poured out to the *genius Augusti* at both public and private banquets.¹²⁸ Taken together, the act of Octavian honoring the *genius* of Julius Caesar and the act of Octavian decreeing that libations be poured out to his *genius* signals to the observer that Octavian is both the legitimate *son* of Divus Julius and the *father* of the Roman state.¹²⁹

Beginning with the adoption of Octavian, the Imperial adoptions were publicly celebrated events that seamlessly combined political and religious overtones. Knowledge of Imperial adoptions was spread through inscriptions on monuments, images on Imperial coins, and civic and religious ceremonies and commemorations.¹³⁰ Octavian broadcast his adoptive lineage on coins bearing the title *divi filius*, or DF, to remind people that he was son of the divine Julius Caesar.¹³¹ The *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* records several official religious honorings of adoptions, including the adoption of Nero by Claudius, where sacrifices were offered *ob adoptionem*.¹³² The adoption of Hadrian by Trajan was publicized with coins bearing the word “ADOPTIO,” and other coins from earlier

124 See Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, 231–64.

125 Ibid., 299.

126 Lewis, *Paul’s “Spirit of Adoption,”* 48.

127 Lily Ross Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1975), 151.

128 Ibid.

129 Ibid., 152.

130 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 69.

131 See Taylor, *Divinity*, 106; 131.

132 Elio Pasoli, *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (Bologna: Zuffi, 1950), 76–77.

Imperial reigns also disseminated news of adoptions.¹³³ Inscriptions bearing dedications to Claudius and Domitian broadcast their adoptive lineage,¹³⁴ as did various permanent monuments in Rome.¹³⁵ Thus although the general public in the empire may not have been privy to all of the details of these high-profile adoptions, knowledge of them was certainly widespread even in remote parts of the Empire, and moreover, the propaganda disseminated through official Imperial channels was both religious and political. Therefore, in light of these widely publicized acts of adoption, it is safe to presume that Paul's audiences would have been familiar with the Roman concept and ideology of adoption as a strategy for securing a son and heir and for maintaining the *genius* of a *paterfamilias*.

Conclusion

I argued in the previous chapter that metaphors all rely on the models lurking beneath their surfaces to create meaning for their audiences by evoking mental simulations in the minds of the readers/hearers.¹³⁶ Thus, plumbing the depths of a metaphor's possible implications involves attempting to identify the model or models lurking below its surface. The role of the model is to provide the concrete object or real-world state of affairs that makes up the structure of the metaphor's vehicle, which in the case of this study is *νιοθεσία*. However, I have shown in this chapter that determining which model or models are submerged beneath the metaphor is not necessarily a straightforward or simple process. For example, any number of creeping entities may be lurking beneath the surface of the creeping tomorrow in Macbeth's famous soliloquy. How are we to say precisely what kind of creeping creature or creeping thing comes to mind when Macbeth laments, "Tomorrow, and Tomorrow, and Tomorrow, Creeps in this petty pace from day to day." The beauty of the

133 See Christopher Howgego, *Ancient History from Coins* (London: Routledge, 1995), 80–82; plate no. 132.

134 Herrmann, *New Documents from Lydia*, 31–32; Auzépy, "Campagne de prospection," 342–43.

135 See, e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.14 for a record of the altars of Tiberius and Livia; "Great Antonine Altar" at Ephesus; and various examples of portraiture of the adopted sons of Augustus (see Charles Brian Rose, *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period* [Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997], 62–63 (plates 82, 94, 175, 212, 240), 71–72 (plates 151, 205).

136 Black, "More about Metaphor," 31.

metaphor lies in the indeterminacy of its evocation of various models and the vivid mental simulations they create. Is Tomorrow creeping the way the second hand of a clock seems to move agonizingly slowly? Or does Tomorrow shuffle along, an old man moving neither with conviction nor purpose through the mundane details of daily life? Or would Shakespeare have us view Tomorrow as something more insidious? Perhaps tomorrow is a predator creeping up on its unsuspecting prey? It is difficult to say that any of these models is the “correct” model, or even that one is present to the exclusion of the others within a single interpreter.¹³⁷

In this chapter I have shown that there are many factors at play in explicating how the *υιοθεσία* metaphors relate to their underlying models including: intertextual considerations, cultural differences between audience members, and varying levels of familiarity with the legal practice of adoption in the first century. In the analysis above I have attempted to cast a broad net in gathering the possibilities for constructing the underlying model of Paul’s *υιοθεσία* metaphors, and perhaps the indeterminate and imprecise nature of the relationships between a metaphor and its underlying models results in what can, at best, be described as a “rough sketch.” Roughly then, the various literary sources from the three backgrounds all illuminate, to varying degrees, that adoption was considered a means of installing a son (and rarely a daughter) in a family (not of his birth) by means of legal decree, and that this relationship mirrored, to some extent, the relationship between a natural father and son. In both Greek and Roman sources where the legal practice of adoption is in view there is a strong connection between adoption and inheritance, and the purpose of adoption was to secure a suitable heir to take over the father’s name, cult, and estate. Roman adoption rather uniquely emphasized the initiative and power of the *paterfamilias* in the adoption process, both in giving his children for adoption and receiving adoptive children *in potestate*. Though the Greek and Roman practices were divergent in some respects, Jewish, Greek, and Latin sources seem to indicate a fairly high level of cultural agreement on what adoptive relationships were, and also, in general, speak with consonant voices as to the general purpose of adoption.

However, though a broad general picture of adoption exists, there is no way of pinpointing exactly which features, which cultural assumptions, which religious overtones, which legal practices, or which texts an audience member would associate with the metaphor in their own mental simulation. This is not to say that an audience member would associate a multitude of various

137 Indeed, the more we ruminate on a metaphor the more possible models come to mind, and often models mutually reinterpret and reinforce one another.

features, but rather to say that various audience members would be unlikely to simulate exactly the same features. To Jewish readers or gentile proselytes the Jewish features were likely more salient than the Greek adoption background. To gentile readers in Rome the high profile Imperial adoptions may have been the most salient source for the metaphor's model. Furthermore, intertextual considerations nudge us to consider the possibility that these various models interpret and reinterpret each other in the new contexts of the Pauline metaphors.

Since it is impossible to determine which features of which models were associated by audience members and which were not, the best course of action in the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors is to consider the implications that arise from the broadest generalities of the models first and then proceed to what are seemingly less salient features. We must also keep in mind that not every aspect of a model is evoked by a metaphor, and so those aspects of the models that are at odds with Paul's argument in the context of Romans and Galatians can be eliminated from consideration. A sketch is by definition a rough representation of the nuances present in the various evocations by various hearers of the υἱοθεσία metaphors. Perhaps it is enough here to acknowledge the roughness of this sketch and the mysterious interplay between metaphor and model, and to treat the exegesis of the υἱοθεσία metaphors not as a clue or a message to be decoded, but as the appreciation of a diversely textured painting or a tightly woven and intricately sewn garment.

We have Received the Adoption to Sonship: The υἱοθεσία Metaphor in Galatians 4:5

Introduction

Introduction to the Exegetical Chapters

The three preliminary chapters of methodological considerations have laid the groundwork for moving in a considerably different direction than the approach taken by previous studies on the υἱοθεσία metaphors. Rather than treating the text as a container from which meaning can be extracted and dissected, my approach in the following chapters will attempt to treat the text more like a performance to be experienced. Rather than attempting to distill Paul's metaphorical language into "literal" paraphrases, my approach aims to allow the affective and emotive potential of the υἱοθεσία metaphors to speak alongside their cognitive content, as all of these elements are evoked in the process of mental simulation. As Richard Hays pointedly remarks, "Can anyone seriously suppose that the best way to interpret the writings of an author [Paul] . . . is to paraphrase his ideas into univocal concepts?"¹ Taking a cue from Hays, I suggest at the outset of my exegesis that the success of the exegetical analysis should be measured by how effective it is in exposing the multivalent and multisensory dimensions of Paul's metaphors, not by how well it paraphrases or discovers the "real meaning beneath the metaphor." This view is representative of a major paradigm shift that is occurring in the exegesis of other biblical metaphors,² and if Pauline scholars take seriously the insights from philosophical and cognitive approaches to metaphor, then it is also one that is necessary to adopt and develop further if we are to appreciate the artistry and power in Paul's writing.

Having established the importance of changing the interpretive framework through which metaphors are encountered in the first part of this study, the

¹ Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, xxxiv.

² This view of metaphor is also seen in Howe, *Because You Bear This Name*; Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*; Gray, *Words and Pictures in Psalm 18*; Løland, *Silent or Salient Gender*? However, none of these studies have combined insights from philosophical approaches to metaphor with insights from cognitive and sociolinguistics in their methodologies, nor have they looked specifically at the effect of metaphor on perception and emotion.

aim in the exegetical chapters is to encounter the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Paul afresh. Undoubtedly the new interpretive framework I have proposed will—at times—feel unfamiliar when it is put to use for exegesis. The most formidable difference in the following exegetical chapters is the shift from focusing solely on “what metaphors mean” to treating also “how metaphors mean.” That is to say, in light of the methodological considerations elucidated in the previous chapters, the exegetical analysis will focus both on the textual aspects of the metaphor, and on how the *υιοθεσία* metaphors shape extra-textual elements such as perception, emotion, and the formation of identity. Each chapter will have two distinct parts of analysis, the first focusing on identifying each *υιοθεσία* metaphor in its individual context, its appropriate tenor and vehicle(s), and level of resonance in that context, and the second part focusing on its potential to structure the experiences and change the emotions and perceptions of its audience when they engage in mental simulation of the metaphor(s). While insights from these two parts might shed some light upon what and how these *υιοθεσία* metaphors mean, an equally significant contribution of the exegesis is to provide an example of a new methodology for biblical scholars to utilize in reading and appreciating biblical metaphors beyond those treated in this study.

Introduction to Galatians

In order to ascertain the full effect of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 some preliminary remarks regarding Paul's audience and opponents in Galatia are necessary. First, although scholars are divided as to the provenance and addressees of Galatians,³ there is a firm consensus that Paul's audience was made up of gentile believers.⁴ Indeed Martinus de Boer remarks, “There is no indication that any of them are Jews by birth.”⁵ Although the date and

3 Several new studies have begun to turn the tide toward scholarship favoring a south Galatia theory (see esp. Rainer Riesner, *Die Fruhzeit des Apostels Paulus: Studien zur Chronologie, Missionstrategie und Theologie* [WUNT 71, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994]; Cilliers Breytenbach, *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f; 16,6; 18,23* [AGJU 38, Leiden: Brill, 1996]; Thomas Witulski, *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam* [FRLANT 193, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000. For a defense of the north-Galatian theory see James Moffat, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1933]; Martyn, *Galatians*.

4 See Betz, *Galatians*; Martinus C. de Boer, *Galatians* (NTL, Louisville: WJK, 2011); Martyn, *Galatians*, 16. A minority of scholars see some Jews as present in Paul's audience (e.g., W. D. Davies, review of *Galatians*, by Hans Dieter Betz, *RelSRev* 7.4 [1981]: 310–18; Stephen Mitchell, *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 5.

5 De Boer, *Galatians*, 5.

location of the original addressees of the letter are unquestionably important for the interpretation of other passages in Galatians (e.g., 2:1–15), the most salient feature of the addressees for interpreting the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is the ethnic and religious background of Paul's audience. Regardless of whether one adopts a northern or southern hypothesis, or a pre-Jerusalem council or post-council date, this decision does not directly affect, or even address, the issue of the audience's ethnic make-up. Brigitte Kahl, in her monograph *Galatians Re-Imagined*, argues forcefully that in their pursuit of attempting to harmonize the setting of Galatians with the data from Acts, scholars have entirely neglected the question of who Paul's Galatian readers actually were.⁶ Instead, Kahl argues that most scholars are content to define these readers with the generic label "gentile," without reckoning with the history and social experience of the Galatians that inhabited the regions Paul evangelized. Certainly, most scholars agree that Paul's designation of his audience as "Galatians" almost certainly implies that Paul's audience was comprised of gentiles, and not ethnic Jews,⁷ but who were these "Galatians" and what was life like for them under the omnipresent gaze of the Roman Empire?

Kahl's treatment of the historical and cultural setting of the book of Galatians traces the ancestry and cultural experience of the Galatian people back to 387 BCE when Rome is sacked by the Gauls.⁸ This battle marks the beginning of fierce and embittered conflict between Rome and the Gauls/Galatians, and this conflict continues for several centuries until Julius Caesar conquers and subdues the entire territory of Gaul between the years 58–52 BCE, enslaving or killing two million Galatians in the process.⁹ In Roman literature, the Gauls were portrayed as fierce and dangerous barbarians who inhabited the territory beyond the Alps and also in Asia.¹⁰ Likewise, Roman literature depicts the eventual defeat of the Gauls/Galatians by Roman forces as the defeat of lawlessness and the restoration of justice and order.¹¹ Kahl also points out that Rome engaged in rituals of human sacrifice using Galatian victims at three key points in their history, and these were done to "make atonement to the gods and to save Rome."¹² With an eye toward mapping the semiotics of various cultural icons, Kahl analyzes several important pieces of Greek and Roman

6 Kahl, *Galatians Re-imagined*, 25–30.

7 James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (BNTC, London: A & C Black, 1993), 6.

8 Kahl, *Galatians Re-imagined*, xix.

9 *Ibid.*, xxi.

10 *Ibid.*, 49.

11 *Ibid.*, 53–54.

12 *Ibid.*, 54–55.

artwork, such as the Great Alter of Pergamon and the Dying Trumpeter, which depict dead and dying Galatians in the role of the archetypal and mythic enemies of the gods and the empire.¹³ Furthermore, Kahl argues that the Galatians not only were routinely confronted with images of dead and dying Galatians, but also that in order to participate in this new Roman society the Galatians were required to shed their identity as “other” and instead embrace the Roman perspective of their former selves.¹⁴ Kahl pointedly states, “This act of submission elevates the ones/us far above the rebellious and lawless others/them that stay *out* and *down* as dying and dead, while the compliant self can move in and up to partake in the life of the city of the civilized.”¹⁵ As they read through the lens of a vanquished and subjugated people, the Galatians’ experience and history with the Roman Empire undoubtedly colored how Paul’s Galatian readers understood concepts and images like “law,” “justice,” “crucifixion,” and so forth. Thus for Kahl, by the time Paul pens his letter to the Galatians, this vanquished people has been subjected to the “othering” of their former identities by means of Imperial propaganda, and has been forced into both physical and ideological submission to the Roman Empire.

Kahl’s re-imagination of the Galatian people creates a vivid backdrop for the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5. However, her analysis of the predicament Paul addresses in Galatians is more tenuous and problematic. For Kahl, the issue is not between Jewish infiltrators and gentile Galatians, but rather both groups are at odds with the common and pervasive enemy: the Roman Empire. Kahl argues that both the Jews and Galatians were in social spaces characterized by weakness and subjugation: the Jews as a *religio licita* and the Galatians as a vanquished people brought into order through Roman law and justice.¹⁶ In Kahl’s view then, the real problem in Galatians is that the Galatians are associating with Jews without becoming Jewish, which is a threat to the hierarchy established by Rome whereby both Jews and Galatians are kept under close control by Imperial regulations. Thus the Jewish agitators in Galatia are not concerned with the Galatians keeping Torah for its own sake, but rather the Jewish community fears repercussions from Rome should the gentile Galatians appear to be subverting Rome’s authority by becoming Jewish without fully converting. In Kahl’s view, the “quasi-conversion” of the Galatians would have been perceived as a threat to Imperial monotheism (emperor worship), and

13 Ibid., 77–127.

14 Ibid., 169–207.

15 Ibid., 147.

16 Ibid., 209–242.

would likely have garnered swift retaliatory action against both the Jews and the Galatians.¹⁷

However, while Kahl's case regarding the agitators is interesting, it seems to dismiss too quickly that the thrust of Paul's argument is directed at these Jewish agitators, and not at Rome. Thus, even if Kahl is right about their motives for pushing the Galatians to adopt Torah, it is unclear whether her proposed solution is sufficient for understanding Paul's own articulation of Torah for his Galatian audience over and against the message of the false teachers. In Paul's autobiographical account of his commission from the risen Christ, the contrast he presents is between "advancing in Judaism" and preaching the gospel to the gentiles (Gal 2:14–16), rather than between the Jews, Galatians, and the influence of Rome. This is further evidenced by Peter's behavior in Antioch, where he feared "men from the circumcision" (Gal 2:12) and not "men from Caesar." Furthermore, Paul's articulation of "works of the law" is buttressed with supporting texts and examples from the Old Testament rather than references or allusions to Roman law throughout his letter (e.g., 3:6, 8, 10–11, 13, 16 4:21–31). Thus although Kahl's case for a Roman background to νόμος in Galatians is creative, it does not adequately account for the data within the text itself. Perhaps, then, what should be taken from Kahl's study is a rich picture of who the Galatians were, and how their identity as a vanquished and subjugated people might have influenced how they heard Paul's strong words of rebuke and correction regarding the νόμος and their new identity in Christ.

Kahl's argument must also be weighed against what other scholars have asserted regarding the relationship Paul's audience had with the local synagogues prior to their conversion. While scholars agree that Paul's audience was comprised of gentiles, they disagree as to whether the gentiles were "righteous gentiles" (or godfearers) prior to their contact with Paul,¹⁸ or if the addressees acquired their competence and familiarity with Jewish practices and Scriptures through their interaction with Paul.¹⁹ Nanos's claim that Paul's addressees were gentiles involved with "Jesus subgroups" within the larger Jewish

17 Ibid.

18 E.g., Verena Jegher-Bucher, *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik: ein anderes Paulusbild* (ATANT 78, Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991), 14.

19 Mark Nanos observes that most interpreters assume this is the case. However, he asserts that "such a conclusion is not warranted . . . the evidence for their status as pagans or righteous Gentiles prior to involvement with Paul, apart from arguable interpretive motives, is not clear" (*The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 77; despite all of her work on the ethnic background of the Galatians in *Galatians Re-imagined*, Kahl does not address this question in her book.

communities notwithstanding,²⁰ Paul's reference to ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας (the churches/assemblies in Galatia) makes it far more likely that Paul's addressees were functioning as a community in their own right. There is a paucity of evidence that ἐκκλησία (church/assembly) was used to describe local Jewish communities in a particular place,²¹ which suggests that Paul uses the term to differentiate his audience from the surrounding religious subgroups.²² Trebilco argues that although other non-Christian Jews could have used both ἐκκλησία (assembly) and συναγωγή (synagogue), epigraphic and literary evidence suggests that Jewish assemblies were *not* using ἐκκλησία (assembly) in reference to their assemblies. Thus, ἐκκλησία (church/assembly) was functionally "free" and the term became a way for Christian gatherings (whether Jewish or gentile) to distinguish themselves from the gatherings of the συναγωγή (synagogue).²³ Trebilco's well-researched argument that ἐκκλησία (church/assembly) was a designation used to distinguish between Christ-followers and non-Christian Jews makes the scenario Nanos proposes unlikely. Therefore with the general scholarly consensus, the analysis below will proceed with the understanding that Paul's addressees in Galatia are gentile believers in Christ who became Christ-followers as a result of Paul's mission to the gentiles, and with Kahl, that they have also experienced subjugation and the "othering" of their Galatian identity prior to Paul's contact with them.

Describing the identity of Paul's opponents in Galatia is a much more thorny and difficult task, although for the purpose of examining the υἱοθεσία metaphor it is equally important. Though currently there is a general consensus that Paul's opposition in Galatia were Jewish Christians,²⁴ the debate in scholarship still rages over the source and nature of the arguments Paul is trying to counter, and what label is appropriate for Paul's opposition. Several versions of an older

20 Ibid., 317.

21 Although there has been some recent discussion on the precise background of the term, scholars agree that ἐκκλησία was not a designation Jews used for their assemblies; see George H. van Kooten, "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies," *NTS* 58.4 (2012): 535; Paul Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 449–53; idem, *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 164–207; Gregory K. Beale, "The Background of ἐκκλησία Revisited," *JSNT* 38.2 (2015): 151–168; see also Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 74–110, esp. 80–81.

22 Or possibly, as van Kooten argues, as an alternative to the civic assemblies ("Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, 536–48).

23 Trebilco, "Why Did the Early Christians," 456.

24 Mark Nanos is a notable exception to this consensus (*The Irony of Galatians*, 316–18).

theory purport that Paul was countering two rival messages, a Judaizing group and a group of pneumatics (freien Geister) who were exaggerating his teachings on Christian freedom.²⁵ Contrary to the widely held belief that the agitators were Jewish (either Jewish-Christians or non-Christian Jews), Johannes Munck argued that Paul's opposition was instead comprised of a group of law-observant gentiles.²⁶ However, both of these theories have been discarded by recent Pauline scholarship, which overwhelmingly favors the view that Paul's opponents are law-observant Christian Jews who argued, "Christian existence takes place within the terms of the Jewish Torah covenant."²⁷

Scholars who see Paul's opposition as some kind of Jewish Christian constituency still span a spectrum of views on how best to label them and as to what primary concerns they had with the gentile congregation in Galatia. Richard Longenecker unhesitatingly refers to Paul's opposition in Galatia as "Judaizers," and states, "Their message was therefore, in effect, one of both legalism for full salvation and nomism for Christian living."²⁸ J. Louis Martyn attempts to avoid the polemical connotation of "Judaizers," and instead adopts the label "Teachers." Despite their differences in terminology, Martyn, with Longenecker, also concludes that these opponents are Christian Jews who "have connections both with Diaspora Judaism and with Palestinian, Christian Judaism. . . . [T]he Teachers are messianic Jews."²⁹ However, Martyn argues that the Teachers' primary concern was not law-observance for Christian living, but rather observance of the law as the means by which gentile Christians were to be included in God's people, Israel.³⁰

In contradistinction to Martyn and Longenecker, Nanos's designation of Paul's opposition as non-Christian, Jewish "influencers" represents a minority view. Nanos claims that his "reevaluation of the evidence suggests that the Galatian influencers were not believers in Jesus Christ, nor was their message good news of Christ."³¹ While Nanos is to be commended for his insistence that

25 Wilhelm Lütgert, *Gesetz und Geist: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs* (BFCT 22, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1919); James H. Ropes, *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians* (HTS 14, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929).

26 Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke (London: SCM, 1959), 89.

27 Betz, *Galatians*, 8–9; see also Longenecker's summary of the research on the Galatian opponents (*Galatians*, lxxxviii–c).

28 Longenecker, *Galatians*, xcvi.

29 J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, 118.

30 *Ibid.*, 122–26.

31 Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians*, 317. Nanos argues that non-Christian Jews are much more likely to have compelled the gentiles to conform to the norms of the Jewish community

neutral terminology for Paul's opposition is preferable to terms like "Judaizers," which can unduly skew the reading of the text,³² most scholars have rejected his attempt to dissociate Paul's opposition from a Christian message (εὐαγγέλιον), based on Paul's own characterization of these agitators in the text of the letter (e.g., 1:6–7; 5:12; 6:12–13).³³

In light of the designations proposed by various scholars above, it is clear that no designation is without its faults, nor will a designation be perceived with the same connotations by all. Therefore, however imperfect the term, I propose that the most agreeable solution is to adopt Paul's designation for his opposition as "the agitators" (οἱ ταρασσόντες). Moreover, although the literature on Paul's opponents in Galatia is already abundant, and I have little to add to the discussion, I would suggest here that in light of the focus of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor it is likely that Martyn's view of the agitators as a group of Jewish Christians conducting a law-observant mission to the gentiles is the most apt characterization.³⁴

Since it is unlikely that the agitators in Galatia were non-Christian Jews, as Nanos has suggested, the question most pertinent to sketching a characterization of these Christian Jews is undoubtedly, "To what end the law?" Is the law in the agitators' message functioning as a means to salvation and Christian nomism, or is it functioning as a boundary marker that distinguishes the "true children of Abraham" from the gentiles? While Longenecker's arguments for seeing the law as a means to salvation and Christian nomism have much merit and Scriptural support, this characterization of the agitators' message does not provide a satisfying explanation for Paul's sustained interaction with Abraham and his seed (3:6–9, 15–18, 23–29; 4:21–5:1). In his analysis, Longenecker focuses too narrowly on the "full inheritance of the blessings of the Abrahamic

(ibid., 215–21), they have much more at stake in the debate over circumcision (ibid., 222–25), and that "Paul's critique of the influencers' lawlessness is based upon *his own interested view* in response to his understanding of Jesus as the Christ of Israel and Savior of the nations" (ibid., 228 [emph. mine]).

32 Ibid., 115–92.

33 E.g., Martinus C. de Boer, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos, *BibInt* 12.4 (2004): 422; Peter Oakes, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos, *JSS* 49.1 (2004): 166–67; Erik Heen, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 376–77; Graham Stanton, review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos, *JTS* 56.2 (2005): 271. In addition, I would add that Paul's mention of "false believers" in 2:4 is implicitly drawing a parallel between the agitators in Jerusalem and the agitators in Galatia.

34 Martyn, *Galatians*, 117–26.

covenant” for “those who rely on faith” and does not fully address the issue of spiritual lineage and the covenant, which seems to have been of preeminent importance to both Paul and the agitators.³⁵ Indeed, Paul’s prolonged explanation of Abraham and his offspring suggests that a central message of the agitators involved law-keeping as a means of entrance into Israel and addressed the question, “Who are Abraham’s true children?”³⁶ If a central part of the agitators’ message focused on the importance of spiritual lineage, as I will argue in detail below, then the υιοθεσία metaphor functions as a means of countering the claims of the agitators. In light of Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor, Abraham’s offspring are not those who take upon themselves the yoke of Torah, but rather those who receive their spiritual lineage through their adoption by God. Accordingly, Martyn’s view of the identity of the agitators as Christian Jews and the message of the agitators as the need for law observance to obtain the blessing and spiritual inheritance of Abraham is the most convincing option.³⁷

Galatians 4:5 in the Context of Galatians

Most commentaries point to Galatians 4:4–5 as the crowning theological statement of Paul’s letter.³⁸ The υιοθεσία metaphor occurs at the heart of this statement; it is the culmination of the Son’s mission of redemption, and it combines the actions of the Father, Son, and Spirit within a single metaphor (υιοθεσία) that is grounded in the believers’ reception of the Spirit.³⁹ Furthermore, a key component to Paul’s argument is the link between the Galatians’ reception of the Spirit and their identity as children of Abraham.⁴⁰ Of particular relevance for analysis of the υιοθεσία metaphor is Paul’s designation of believers as “sons of Abraham” (υιοί εἰσιν Ἀβραάμ) in Galatians 3:7. If Paul is designating *gentile* believers as “sons of Abraham,” this is a bold and incendiary label.⁴¹ Leaving aside for a moment the group of whom Paul predicates υιοθεσία

35 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 112–16.

36 Fee recognizes this as the central question in Galatians (“Who are Abraham’s True Children?: The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation,” in *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham*, ed. Stephen Hunt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 128–31; see also Martyn’s discussion (*Galatians*, 302–306).

37 Martyn, *Galatians*, 117–26.

38 E.g., De Boer, *Galatians*, 261; Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 85–137; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 177; Martyn, *Galatians*, 406.

39 De Boer, *Galatians*, 250.

40 Stephen Fowl, “Who Can Read Abraham’s Story?: Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians,” *JSNT* 55 (1994): 79.

41 Gunther Jüncker, “‘Children of Promise’: Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans,” *BBR* 17.1 (2007): 133 (emph. orig.).

(Jew or gentile), it is significant to first note that Paul's mode of receiving sonship in Galatians 4:5 is through the Father-initiated mission of redemption by the Son. Sonship is further connected with the reception of the Spirit who testifies that the believers are heirs through God, rather than through Abraham.

A further preliminary issue to consider is whether Galatians 4:4–5 are Paul's own composition or, as many have suggested, are a pre-Pauline fragment. Those who point to a pre-Pauline origin of these verses rightly observe the uniqueness of the description of the Son as "born of a woman" (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός) and "born under the law" (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον); these phrases appear nowhere else in the Pauline corpus. Furthermore, the chiasmic structure of the two verses creates a memorable and creed-like formulation of the mission of the Son, which to some has suggested that these verses were drawn from a liturgical setting in the early church.⁴² However, it is also quite possible that these verses are of Paul's own creation. In regard to the υἱοθεσία metaphor in particular, given the dearth of evidence for other Christian uses of υἱοθεσία outside of the Pauline corpus,⁴³ and Paul's peculiar affinity for the term at several crucial points in his own writing (Rom 8:15, 23; 9:4), it is at least a plausible explanation that the presence of υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 points toward Pauline authorship of these verses. Nevertheless, the issue of their exact provenance will likely never be fully resolved, and as Hays remarks, "[E]ven if these Christological formulations have their origins in hypothetical pre-Pauline traditions, they are united, *at the level of Paul's usage of them*, in a single story-structure."⁴⁴

For the purpose of analyzing the υἱοθεσία metaphor I will make two observations in regard to the issue of composition in verses 4–5: (1) even if these verses are a pre-Pauline fragment, Paul has appropriated and fully integrated the text in order to make his own point about the believers' sonship in relation to the Son, and (2) if Paul is using a well-known liturgical text or pithy statement to articulate his view of sonship then, being familiar to his audience members, it probably would have had an even greater impact on community identity. However, since there is no way of determining precisely the origin or

42 Eduard Schweitzer's article is perhaps the most nuanced approach to the *Sendungsformel*, as he argues that 4:4–5 is not necessarily a fixed formula but an expression of a traditional "Denkschema." ("Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der 'Sendungsformel' Gal 4:4f. Rom 8:3f. Joh 3:16f. I Joh 4:9," *ZNW* 57 (1966): 207–208); see also Betz's review of the literature (*Galatians*, 205–206).

43 With the only possible exception being Ephesians 1:5 if one rejects Pauline authorship, and even then it is striking that the only occurrence of υἱοθεσία outside of Pauline literature occurs in a letter clearly dependent on Paul's theological vocabulary.

44 Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 111 (emph. orig.).

audience's level of familiarity with this text I will treat it below as it stands in Paul's argument in Galatians, without speculating as to what impact it might have had if it were familiar to his audience already.

An additional preliminary issue that must be addressed is Paul's shifting pronouns in Galatians 4:1–7. The crux of the issue here is whether Paul is differentiating between Jews and gentiles when he switches from the first-person plural to the second-person plural. Scholars are relatively evenly divided between those who see Paul as including both Jews and gentiles in his use of ἡμεῖς (we) (Gal 4:3) and first-person plural verbs (ἡμεν, ἡμεθα, ἀπολάβωμεν), or if Paul is using the first-person plural here to designate Jews only, as he does in 2:15 and possibly also in 3:24–25. Scholars who view Paul as addressing two groups of people argue that, “[T]he apparently awkward shifts, from first person in verse 5 to second person in verse 6 and then back again, are necessary because Paul is talking about different groups of people.”⁴⁵ Representative of this view, Longenecker remarks, “The first person plural of 4:3, as well as that of 4:5, ought to be understood as referring primarily to Jewish believers: in v 3 as Paul's application of his illustration of the Jewish experience under the custodianship of the law and in vv 4–5 as Paul's quotation of an early Jewish Christian confessional portion.”⁴⁶

However, despite the careful analysis and the cogent arguments of scholars who see the pronouns as differentiating Jew from gentile, there are good reasons for interpreting these pronouns as inclusive of both Jew and gentile throughout 4:1–7.⁴⁷ As Martyn remarks, “Skillfully using sometimes the first person plural—‘we’—and sometimes the second person plural—‘you’ (with the addition once of ‘the’)—Paul paints a doleful picture of the whole of humanity.”⁴⁸ One important issue to consider is whether Paul would use the phrase ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (we were enslaved under the elemental forces of the world) in 4:3 to refer solely to Jews, and whether it is parallel to ὑπὸ νόμον (under the law), which occurs once in 3:23 and twice in 4:4–5. Clinton Arnold observes that there exists “a conceptual relationship between ‘law’ and *stoicheia*,” but that the phrases are not necessarily coextensive.⁴⁹ Some scholars,

45 John Taylor, “The Eschatological Interdependence of Jews and Gentiles in Galatians,” *TynBul* 63.2 (2012): 312.

46 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 164.

47 Richard Hays put forth a mediating view which sees the referent change in the middle of verse 5 from Jews alone to Jews and gentiles (*Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101).

48 Martyn, *Galatians*, 385.

49 Clinton Arnold, “Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3, 9,” *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 68.

such as Longenecker, who argue that the first person pronouns in 4:1–7 refer to Jewish Christians, take a positive view of the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (elemental forces of the world), suggesting that they refer to the basic principles of religion for Jews (in 4:3) and for gentiles (in 4:9).⁵⁰ Under this scheme, ὑπὸ νόμον (under law) and ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (under the elemental forces) are parallel in 3:23 and 4:3, but not in 4:9 where πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα (beggary elements) refer to the “ineffectual regulations and principles”⁵¹ which enslaved the gentiles. Although this scheme allows for a more positive view of the Torah, it seems difficult to maintain that the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) refer to different things in 4:3 and 4:9, particularly because the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) are depicted negatively as enslaving (δεδουλωμένοι) elements in 4:3.

However, if the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) in 4:1–9 are taken to enslave both Jews and gentiles, and if ὑπὸ νόμον (under the law) is taken as a phrase of close association, then the entire passage can be read as Paul’s grim picture of universal humanity. In Galatians 4, Paul portrays the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) in wholly negative terms, emphasizing their domination, enslavement, and malevolence.⁵² Moreover, in Galatians 3–4, the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) and the law are described as parallel entities, which both possess the power to enslave, and Paul’s “we” is the universal “we” of humanity who is held in slavery under the power of the νόμος (law) and the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces). The same group—common humanity—is subject to both entities.⁵³ If Paul’s “we” (ἡμεῖς) refers to humanity under the universal predicament of sin, Paul also then includes gentiles in his description τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον (those under the law) (4:4–5) in order to emphasize that God’s redemptive activity is likewise universal in its scope.⁵⁴ The parallelism between the στοιχεῖα (elemental forces) in 4:3 and 4:9 strongly suggests that Paul intends the pronouns throughout the

50 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 165–66; see also Linda Belleville, “‘Under Law’: Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21–4:11,” *JSNT* 26 (1986): 53–78.

51 Belleville, “Under Law,” 70.

52 Arnold, “Returning to the Domain,” 63. At one point in his article Arnold argues that ἡμεῖς in 4:3 refers only to Jewish Christians (“Ibid., 60). However, Arnold later argues, “The *stoicheia* are initially presented as guardians who exerted an enslaving influence (ἡμεῖς δεδουλωμένοι Gal 4:3) over *both Gentiles and Jews*” (Ibid., 64 [emph. mine]). N.b., even if one does not see the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου as demonic beings, it is still quite possible to understand Paul’s language in terms of negative personification (so *ibid.*, 55–76).

53 Martyn, *Galatians*, 393.

54 De Boer, *Galatians*, 264.

passage to be read inclusively, particularly when one closely examines the relationship between verses 5 and 6.⁵⁵

Not only are the arguments I have just discussed for interpreting the first person and second person pronouns as differentiating between Jews and gentiles unconvincing, it also seems unlikely that ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν (so that we might receive the adoption to sonship) refers to Jews alone, as those who see these two groups represented separately in the pronominal shifts in 4:1–7 claim. Rather, there is both internal and external evidence that suggests that Paul's intention is to include both Jews and gentiles in his argument throughout 4:1–9. First, contrary to Longenecker's assertion that υἰοθεσία "was probably also a word used within the Judaism of Paul's day and by Jewish Christians generally," there is no evidence in other Jewish sources that this was the case in regard to Israelite sonship.⁵⁶ Moreover, in Romans 9:4 υἰοθεσία is listed as one of the historic privileges of Israel, and there Paul is quite clearly referencing the period of time before the Christ-event. Although it is slightly anachronistic to use Paul's statement in Romans 9:4 as evidence against υἰοθεσία pertaining to Jewish *Christians* alone in Galatians 4:5, it does seem unlikely that Paul would single out the sonship of Jewish-Christians specifically in Galatians since he is also willing to use the term to describe the status of the Israelites prior to Christ's coming in Romans 9:4.⁵⁷ If, in Paul's mind, Jewish-Christians have already received adoption to sonship (Rom 9:4), why must he single them out as the recipients of adoption in Christ in Galatians 4:5? In contrast, Paul's use of υἰοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 seems to have strong parallels to his use in Romans 8:15, where, as I will argue below, both Jewish and gentile believers are in view.

Second, if the pronouns in 4:1–7 are meant to differentiate between Jews and gentiles, then it is difficult to explain the relationship between verses 5 and 6. According to those who hold that τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον refers only to the Jews, the assertion in verse 5 that the Son was sent ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν refers only to Jewish believers. Then in verse 6 Paul's shift to the second person form

55 For another good analysis on the pronouns in Galatians 4 see A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Stories of Israel: Grand Thematic Narratives in Galatians* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016), 28–65.

56 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 172. Longenecker points to Romans 9:4–5 which he also sees as a pre-Pauline list of privileges. However, there is no evidence that υἰοθεσία was used as a designation for Israelite sonship by other Jewish writers or communities. See the discussion in chapter 4 and in chapter 7.

57 See also Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 71. However, although she makes a similar point about the relationship between Gal 4:5 and Rom 9:4, Hodge thinks that υἰοθεσία in Gal 4:5 refers *solely* to the gentiles.

of εἶναι indicates that it is the Galatian gentiles who are being spoken of as sons. John Taylor claims,

In 4:6 Paul, after recognising the redemption and adoption (υἰοθεσία) of those under the law through the action of the Son of God, declares that ‘you are sons’; the second person ἐστε (‘you are’) refers to the Gentile Galatians. Both passages then describe the reception of the Spirit by Jewish believers as a *result* of the new eschatological status of the Gentiles.⁵⁸

However, Taylor’s assertion creates an unnatural disjunction between υἰοθεσία in verse 5 and the υἱοί in verse 6. Although Taylor attempts a theological explanation of the shift in referent, the semantic relationship between υἰοθεσία and υἱοί makes it unlikely that these two terms refer to different groups of people when they occur in such close proximity to one another, especially since Paul does not make mention of an explicit differentiation in their respective references. Another possible solution is that the referents change somewhere in the course of 4:1–7 so that ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν (so that we might receive the adoption to sonship) is inclusive of the gentile believers, but ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (so that he might redeem those under the law) and Paul’s example in 4:1–3 refer to Jewish believers.⁵⁹ However, this is problematic because it requires two different referents for the first person forms in verse 3 (ἡμεῖς, ἡμεν, ἡμεθα) and in verse 5 (υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν). This might seem possible upon first glance, but Paul’s explanation of the significance of adoption in verse 7 (ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος ἀλλ’ υἱός/so that you are no longer a slave but a son) ties together Paul’s example from 4:1–3 and his reference to redemption (ἐξαγοράσῃ) in verse 5. In light of this evidence, it seems more likely that the pronouns throughout Galatians 4:1–7 are inclusive of both Jewish and gentile believers, underlying both the universality of humanity’s enslavement and the totality of the scope of the Son’s mission of redemption.

The final preliminary issue that must be considered is the meaning and use of Αββα ὁ πατήρ in Galatians 4:6. Of course, there is already extensive research and debate surrounding the precise meaning, use, and origins of the *‘abbā* prayer, and thus here it is necessary only to broadly sketch the contours of this research and to briefly address its relevance for interpreting the υἰοθεσία

⁵⁸ Taylor, “Eschatological Interdependence,” 293.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101.

metaphor in Galatians 4:5.⁶⁰ In correlation with the meaning and background of the *ʾabbā* prayer, the possible intertextual connections the *ʾabbā* prayer evokes must also be considered, since these intertextual relationships are also interanimated in the context of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor and the *ʾabbā* prayer in Galatians 4:5–6.

Undoubtedly the most well-known research on the meaning and origin of the *ʾabbā* prayer was carried out by Joachim Jeremias, which appeared in several influential publications.⁶¹ Jeremias argued that *ʾabbā* was “a children’s word, used in everyday talk,” and, in his view, “it would have seemed disrespectful, indeed unthinkable, to the sensibilities of Jesus’ contemporaries to address God with this familiar word.”⁶² Although Jeremias himself did not believe that Jesus’ use of *ʾabbā* reflected the “chatter of a small child,” but rather acknowledged that “even grown-up sons addressed their father as *ʾabbā*,”⁶³ because Jeremias’ research relied heavily on his assertion that *ʾabbā* and *ʾimmā* were the babbling sounds of small children, many of his followers, especially at the popular level, have persisted in equating *ʾabbā* with the English translation “Daddy.”⁶⁴ Jeremias also spoke of “the complete novelty and uniqueness of *Abba* as an address to God in the prayers of Jesus.”⁶⁵ However, Claude Montefiore asserts, “The characteristic note of Jewish piety in this [i.e., the New Testament] age is the thought of God as father—not the father of the people only, as in the Old Testament, but of individuals,”⁶⁶ and Géza Vermes argues

60 See especially James Barr, “Abba’ isn’t ‘Daddy,’” *JTS* 39 (1988): 28–47; Joachim Jeremias, *Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 11 6, London: SCM, 1967) 11–65; Géza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973), 210–11; idem, *Jesus and the World of Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 40–42; for a recent survey and critique of the research on the *ʾabbā* prayer see Georg Schelbert, *Abba Vater: Der literarische Befund vom Altaramäischen bis zu den späten Haggada-Werken* (NTOA 81, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 17–35.

61 Joachim Jeremias, *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966); idem, *The Central Message of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1965), 9–30; idem, *Prayers of Jesus*, 11–65; idem, *New Testament Theology*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1971), 61–68.

62 Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 67.

63 Ibid.

64 E.g., Elaine Herrin lamented the increasing casualness of prayer language among both clergy and laity in her article “Hello, ‘Daddy, God’; Goodbye, Dignity: If You Really Love Jesus Don’t Honk,” *Christianity Today* 28.12 (1984): 88.

65 Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 67.

66 Claude G. Montefiore, *The Old Testament and After* (London: Macmillan, 1923), 203.

that Jesus' use of *'abbā* has significant parallels with its use in the prayers of Jewish charismatics.⁶⁷

Casting Jeremias' theory into an even more dubious position are the numerous examples from both Palestinian and Diaspora sources where God is invoked as the father of individuals, particularly as father of the wise and righteous person. For example, in Wisdom 2:16 the righteous man boasts that "God is his father" (ἀλαζονεύεται πατέρα θεόν), and in 3 Maccabees 6.4 the vocative is used to address God directly ("Father [πάτερ] you destroyed Pharaoh"). Thus Jeremias' claim that no one besides Jesus addressed God as father is difficult to maintain.⁶⁸ Moreover, Sirach, a document of indisputably Palestinian origin, records a prayer to God as "LORD, Father, and God of my life (κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὲ ζωῆς μου) (Sir 23:4)." Although Jeremias dismisses these examples as insufficiently parallel to Jesus' use, or because, in his view, they have been unduly influenced by Hellenism, Allen Mahwhinney is surely correct in his assertion that "the evidence indicates that building upon OT texts such as Prov 3:12; Ps 68:5; 103:13 there was a developing individualistic perception of the fatherhood of God in Judaism around the time of Jesus' earthly ministry."⁶⁹

However, this is not to say that Jesus' use of the Aramaic address to God as *'abbā* was insignificant. Indeed, although Barr takes issue with many of Jeremias' claims regarding *'abbā*, he acknowledges, "It is fair to say that *'abbā* in Jesus' time belonged to a familiar or colloquial register of language, as distinct from more formal and ceremonious usage," but that it also "was not a childish expression comparable with 'Daddy': it was a more solemn, responsible, adult address to a Father."⁷⁰ Although *'abbā* only appears once in the Gospels (Mark 14:36), the Gospels more frequently record Jesus addressing God with the vocatives πάτερ (Father) and πάτερ μου (my Father) (Matt 6:9/Luke 11:2; Matt 11:25/Luke 10:21; Luke 23:34, 46; Matt 26:42; John 11:41; 12:27–28; 17:1–25), and it is possible that the *'abbā* address underlies these occasions as well.⁷¹ Moreover, although Jesus' address may not have been unique among first-century Jews, Jesus' use of *'abbā* and "father" as addresses to God allows his

67 Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 210–11.

68 Jeremias dismisses the importance of 3 Macc 6.4 because of its Hellenistic origin and thus the vocative is "due to Greek influence" (*The Central Message of the New Testament*, 16).

69 Allen Mahwhinney, "God as Father: Two Popular Theories Reconsidered," *JETS* 31.2 (1988): 184.

70 Barr, "'Abba' isn't 'Daddy,'" 46.

71 See James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 24; though Barr's caution is also warranted, "While it is possible that all cases in which Jesus addresses God as 'father' derive from an original *'abbā*, it is impossible to prove that this is so" (*Ibid.*, 46).

readers a glimpse into his intimate relationship with God as Jesus himself understood it.⁷²

Though various critiques of Jeremias' work have cast doubt on the exclusivity of Jesus' use of the *'abbā* prayer,⁷³ it is likely that the preservation of the Aramaic form among the Pauline gentile audiences of Romans and Galatians derives from Jesus' own use of the address. Moreover, Schelbert suggests that the connection forged by *υἱοθεσία* that makes the gentile audience the "seed of Abraham" through Christ also might account for Paul's use of the foreign, Aramaic address.⁷⁴ Thus the significance of the *'abbā* cry in Galatians 4:6 (and Rom 8:15) lies in believers' experience of sonship as an echo of, and participation in, Jesus' own experience of sonship.⁷⁵ Moreover, Paul's employment of *Αββὰ ὁ πατήρ* (*'abbā*, Father) in Galatians 4:6 also undoubtedly evoked rich intertextual relationships with texts from the Jewish tradition that portray *YHWH* as the Father of Israel who loves, provides for, disciplines, and protects his covenant people (e.g., Deut 8:5; 14:1; 32:6; Isa 1:2; 63:7–8; Jer 31:9; Mal 1:6). These Old Testament texts demonstrate that within Judaism, God's fatherhood connoted that God's people could draw near to him with confidence, and it also connoted the filial responsibility a son had to his father.⁷⁶ Given the multivalent nature of intertextual relationships, it is likely that these Old Testament references underlie both Jesus' use of the address and its subsequent iterations among gentile Pauline audiences. These intertextual connections are woven into the cognitive framework created by the *υἱοθεσία* metaphor, which further emphasizes for Paul's Galatian audience that their experience of the Spirit evidences that the God of Israel has brought them into relationship with himself.

Metaphor and Text

The Metaphorical Utterance in Galatians 4:5

In the earlier discussion on metaphorical meaning I indicated that this study will assume that a metaphor's meaning must be determined at the level of a complete metaphorical utterance, rather than being determined by positing a definition for a single word being "used metaphorically."⁷⁷ I also noted that

72 James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM Press, 1975), 24.

73 See esp. Schelbert, *Abba Vater*, 17–34.

74 Ibid., 56.

75 Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit*, 22 (emph. orig.).

76 Mawhinney, "God as Father," 187.

77 See chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 24–53.

a metaphor need not be in the construction “X is a Y,” but rather can occur as any part of speech, such as the direct object of a verb as is the case in Galatians 4:5.⁷⁸ Of the four metaphorical utterances I will consider in this study, the metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is arguably the most textually straightforward in that it is part of a discrete clause, and there are no glaring grammatical ambiguities (e.g., Rom 8:15) or textual issues (e.g., Rom 8:23). Using Soskice’s understanding of a metaphorical utterance, the metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is ἵνα τὴν υιοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν (so that we might receive the adoption to sonship). However, the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 occurs as part of a larger cluster of metaphors, and because Paul clearly intends these metaphors to be considered as parts of a composite picture rather than in isolation, it is important also to identify how the other metaphors in Gal 4:5–7 relate to one another both grammatically and conceptually.

The first issue to consider is how the two ἵνα clauses of verse 5 relate to one another. Identifying the relations within the cluster of metaphors is slightly more complicated for those interpreters who see part, or all, of verse 5 referring only to Jews. Most commentators who see the pronouns as differentiating between Jews and gentiles argue that Paul includes himself with his Jewish compatriots by using the pronoun “we.” Thus “we” throughout the passage refers to the Jews, who are also the ones “under the law” (ὑπὸ νόμον). As I discussed in the previous section of this chapter, by arguing that the metaphors in verse 5 refer to a different group than those in verse 6, this construal of the pronouns places an artificial wedge between the series of closely related metaphors that span verses 5–7 (ἐξαγοράση/redemption, υιοθεσία/adoption to sonship, υἱοί/sons, Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ/abbā, Father, οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος/you are no longer a slave, and ὁ κληρονόμος/heir). For example, Taylor attempts to explain the relationship between verses 5 and 6 by arguing, “Paul is claiming that God sent the Spirit of his Son into the hearts of Jewish believers, including Paul, *because* the gentiles, including the Galatian believers, are now sons.”⁷⁹ This interpretation might solve the exegetical issues surrounding Paul’s shifting pronouns, but it makes little sense of the metaphors in these verses. First, I have already remarked that it is highly unlikely that Paul’s readers would have separated υιοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 from the immediate mention of ἔστε υἱοί (you are sons) into two distinct referents as they mentally simulated the string of metaphor, as Taylor suggests. Moreover, it is odd that Taylor’s interpretation of the pronouns would also require the δοῦλος (slave) metaphor in verse 7 to pertain

78 See chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 20–23.

79 Taylor, “Eschatological Interdependence,” 312.

to Paul's gentile readers, when in Taylor's scheme of verses 1–3 (and implicitly in 5) the δοῦλος (slave) metaphor refers to the situation of the Jews. Upon closer examination, Taylor's analysis requires his readers to ascertain that the Jews are adopted, but not referred to as sons or heirs, and the gentiles are sons and heirs, but are not included in those who receive "adoption." Given the close link between the terms in the metaphor cluster (υἰοθεσία/adoption to sonship, υἱοί/sons, and ὁ κληρονόμος/heir) it is highly unlikely that the audience would distribute the referents of these metaphors between two separate groups of people.

Taking a more balanced and tenable position, Hays argues that the structure in Galatians 4:5 is God "sending forth his Son to bring redemption to those under the Law (=Jews), adoption to 'us' (= Gentiles) and the gift of the Spirit to all who are 'sons' (=Jews and Gentiles together.)"⁸⁰ Hays' approach makes more sense of the cluster of metaphors in Galatians 4:5–7, though it still requires that the readers differentiate between the group receiving redemption (the Jews) and the group receiving adoption (Jews and gentiles). Thus in Hays' view, though it is a less abrupt interpretation, the gentiles are still inserted into the cluster of metaphors midstream. Though grammatically both Hays and Taylor offer a plausible interpretation, it seems more likely that *the cluster of related metaphors* in Galatians 4:1–7 has the same referent throughout.

In Galatians 4:1–7, Paul begins a new cluster of metaphors in verse 1 which function as an extended example to explain the situation of the heirs (κληρονόμοι) in 3:29. Sam Tsang observes that there is significant overlap between the metaphors in Galatians 3:15–4:7 and the vocabulary related to inheritance in descriptions of Greco-Roman households.⁸¹ Indeed, Paul commences by using an extended metaphor of an underage heir (ὁ κληρονόμος νήπιός ἐστιν/the heir is an underage child) to speak about the situation of the heirs of the promise (4:1).⁸² Paul then attaches another metaphor to the heirs when he proclaims them to be no different from a slave (οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου).

80 Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101.

81 Sam Tsang, *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians* (Studies in Biblical Literature 81, New York: Peter Lang, 2005), 117.

82 Sylvia Keesmaat also argues for a high level of continuity between 3:23–29 and 4:1–7 by appealing to the exodus narrative. She claims, "Paul's terminology in 4:1–7, therefore, support[s] the exodus as the interpretative context for these images," and Paul's story "parallels the exodus narrative" (*Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition* [JSNTSup 181, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999] 173). However, her analysis is heavily reliant on Scott's interpretation of Gal 4:1–7 (see the discussion below) and she does not adequately consider the possibility that the link between 3:23–29 and Paul's example in 4:1–3 lies in Paul's layering of metaphors to explain οἱ κληρονόμοι (the heirs).

He continues the slavery metaphor in the next verse (4:3) when he explains that likewise “we were enslaved under the elemental spirits of the world” (ὕπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεῖθα δεδουλωμένοι). Thus by the time Paul reaches verse 4 he has already developed a string of related metaphors, and it is unnatural to allocate these metaphors to separate groups when the images are so closely related. Thus, in light of the metaphors in 4:1–7 building upon the heirs (κληρονόμοι) in 3:29 (where both Jews and gentiles are clearly in view [3:28]) it is most likely that Paul is also including both Jews and gentiles in the first series of metaphors in 4:1–3; therefore in verse 5 both redemption (ἐξαγοράση) and adoption (υἰοθεσία) are being universally extended through the Son’s mission (Gal 4:4). The result of this mission of redemption and adoption is that both Jewish and gentile believers are sons (v. 6a), receive the Spirit who cries “*abbā*, Father” (v. 6b), and are no longer slaves (v. 7), but heirs through God (v. 8). If the metaphors are read as a cluster there is a discernable progression from slavery to sonship brought about by the Son’s mission of redemption and adoption, and given the overlap between the metaphors in 4:1–3 and 4:5–7 it seems difficult to separate their referents into metaphors pertaining to Jewish believers and metaphors pertaining to gentiles.

The Frame: Galatians 4:1–7

The frame, or the immediate surrounding context, of the υἰοθεσία metaphor in Galatians ostensibly begins at 4:1 and ends at 4:7, with λέγω δέ (and I say) introducing Paul’s explanatory example and the example concluding with Paul’s assertion ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰ δοῦλος ἀλλ’ υἱός· εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ (so that you are no longer a slave but a son, and if a son, also an heir through God) in verse 7. However, there are several incongruences in Paul’s example that make elucidating the frame of the metaphor somewhat difficult. First, Paul’s example in verses 1–3 presupposes that the underage heir is already a member of the household, which makes Paul’s inclusion of υἰοθεσία in verse 5 quite jarring.⁸³ Second, although most scholars read Paul’s example through the lens of Greco-Roman law and customs,⁸⁴ the specifics of the example (esp. ἐπίτροπος/

83 Pace Fee who argues, “In its most immediate context this word [υἰοθεσία] picks up the analogy of vv. 1–2 and refers to the time when the ‘son’ enters ‘maturity’” (*Galatians: A Pentecostal Commentary* [Pentecostal Commentary Series, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2007], 150). Frank Matera remarks, “The introduction of the adoption theme is somewhat disruptive since Paul’s example presupposes that the heir is a son or daughter even though he does not explicitly say so” (*Galatians*, [SP, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992], 156).

84 E.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 208–209; De Boer, *Galatians*, 264–65; Dunn, *Galatians*, 217–18; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 169–70; Lyall, *Slaves, Citizens, Sons*, 81–99; Martyn, *Galatians*, 390–91.

guardian and οἰκονόμος/overseer) do not ostensibly comport with external evidence.⁸⁵ This has led some to view Galatians 4:1–7 as an exodus typology,⁸⁶ which attempts to solve some of the exegetical difficulties presented by the Greco-Roman background, which will be discussed below. Although I have argued strongly that metaphors may have more than one underlying model, I also noted that the possible underlying models of the υἱοθεσία metaphors are not necessarily equally salient in each of their occurrences.⁸⁷ In Galatians 4:1–7, despite some of the objections to reading Paul's example through a Greco-Roman lens, I will show that the Greco-Roman household provides a satisfying frame for the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5.

Since the publication of Scott's monograph on the Pauline adoption passages there has been a growing number of scholars who have followed his assertion that Galatians 4:1–7 constitutes Paul's retelling of the "Second Exodus."⁸⁸ Scott claims, "The Exodus typology of the passage sets the sending of the Son (v. 4) in a traditional, messianic framework, which suggests that the υἱοθεσία of the sons (v. 5) should be interpreted in light of the Jewish expectation of divine adoptive sonship in the messianic time based on 2 Sam 7:14."⁸⁹ To support his claim Scott argues that rather than ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους referring to some kind of legal background for "guardians and overseers" as in the consensus view,⁹⁰ these terms "may well refer to the traditional taskmasters of Egypt."⁹¹ However, Scott freely admits that the terms for the Egyptian taskmasters were not established in the first century,⁹² and John Goodrich further observes, "During the

85 See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 137–48.

86 See especially Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 121–86; Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 155–88.

87 I note also that there is not necessarily a contradiction in seeing a plurality of models underlying the metaphorical utterance in which υἱοθεσία occurs (i.e., the utterance evokes both models of Greco-Roman adoption and Jewish sonship) and arguing that the metaphor's frame (Gal 4:1–7) draws upon one background (i.e., a Greco-Roman household) to the exclusion of another (i.e., the Exodus motif).

88 See especially Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 155–88; see also Fee, *Galatians*, 145–51; Matera, *Galatians*, 156–58.

89 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 186.

90 E.g., Dunn, *Galatians*, 210; Fung, *Galatians*, 179–81; J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 10th ed. (London: MacMillan, 1890), 165; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 164; Martyn, *Galatians*, 387–88; Jürgen Becker makes the interesting observation that the collocation of the two terms could be stylistic ("Der Brief an die Galater," in *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon* (NTD 8, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985), 47).

91 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 143.

92 Ibid., 144.

Greek and Roman periods, both ἐπίτροπος [guardian] and οἰκονόμος [overseer] were used to identify the slave or freedman agents and administrators who managed the estates of their principals.”⁹³

Moreover, Scott’s argument rests heavily on reading Galatians 4:1–7 in light of the 2 Samuel 7:14 tradition, and Scott thus identifies the heir, and by extension also the adopted sons, in the passage as referring to collective Israel.⁹⁴ However, it seems unlikely that Paul’s reference to ὁ κληρονόμος (heir) in Galatians 4:1 would refer to Israel as a collective, given that Paul has just used κληρονόμοι (heirs) in conjunction with τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα (Abraham’s seed) in verse 29 to refer to those “who belong to Christ,” and defined the “sons of Abraham” not as the collective of Israel but as οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (the ones from faith) (Gal 3:7), thus including gentiles in the scope of those who receive the inheritance. Furthermore, it is problematic that Scott’s argument relies on the ability of Paul’s audience to screen out any previous understanding they might have regarding ἐπίτροπος (guardian), οἰκονόμος (overseer), and υἱοθεσία in order to perceive the thickly cloaked exodus typology Scott sees lying behind Paul’s words.

Though beset with its own difficulties, reading Galatians 4:1–3 against Greco-Roman legal customs and household life provides a much more likely schema for how Paul’s first audience would have understood his example. Critics of the Greco-Roman background point to the example’s presumption that the Father remains alive throughout the passage, and the lack of parallel examples where ἐπίτροπος (guardian) and οἰκονόμος (overseer) are used to name figures in a Roman *familia*.⁹⁵ They further point to the incongruence of Paul’s insertion of υἱοθεσία where his example presupposes that the underage heir is a natural son of the Father.⁹⁶ Though these criticisms are warranted, there are plausible contextual explanations for why Paul chose to word his example as he did, deviating slightly from the routine procedures of a Greco-Roman household.

Regarding the first objection to a Greco-Roman background, there are two possible explanations for Paul’s portrayal of the father as both alive and able to control the appointed time the son came of age (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρός/until the time appointed by the father). The first explanation is that an

93 John K. Goodrich, “Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul’s Metaphor in Galatians 4:1–2,” *JSNT* 32.3 (2010): 265. Goodrich’s article has a very thorough summary of the primary sources where ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος are used to denote guardians and estate managers (“Guardians, not Taskmasters,” 262–73).

94 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 128–129.

95 E.g., *ibid.*, 137–40; Keesmaat, *Paul and His Story*, 169.

96 Instead, Keesmaat argues that υἱοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 “highlights the actual act of adoption, which took place for Israel in the exodus” (*Paul and his Story*, 164).

example need not comport in precise detail to the specifics of a legal code in order to be understandable to an audience.⁹⁷ Indeed, Paul explains his example sufficiently in its immediate context that the discrepancies with Greek or Roman law fade somewhat into the background. This is seen especially in Paul's assertion that the Father sets the time when the son comes of age, which was, in fact, fixed by the government in Roman law.⁹⁸ Justinian records that males are released from tutelage upon puberty, which Roman law defined as, "*post quartum decimum annum completum* (after completion of the fourteenth year)."⁹⁹ However, although it does not comport with the specifics of Roman law, Paul's insistence on the Father's action in setting the time undergirds his main point: the Son came at the initiative of the Father when the fullness of time had come (ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου). Throughout the letter of Galatians Paul is quite attuned to questions of time, mission, and eschatology. Indeed Martyn has remarked that the two central questions in Galatians are "What time is it?" and "In what cosmos do we actually live?"¹⁰⁰ Thus it would seem that while some of the elements in Paul's example do not comport with the particulars of Roman law, these same elements do fit well within Paul's understanding of eschatology and the Father's initiation of the Son's mission.

Another possible explanation for Paul's portrayal of the Father in the example is that it is not as incongruous with Roman practices as critics allege. Although it is perhaps typical to speak of inheritance in connection with the death of the *paterfamilias*, it is by no means unintelligible to designate a son as an heir prior to the death of the Father.¹⁰¹ Indeed, the primary reason for adoption within Greek and Roman practices was to secure an heir, whether the adoption was a testamentary or *inter vivos* adoption.¹⁰² In addition, it is important to note that "the appointed time" (τῆς προθεσμίας) in the text does not refer to the son inheriting, but rather the Father's indication of the son's majority. Admittedly, Paul's analogy does break down insofar as a human heir

97 See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 164; Matera, *Galatians*, 148–49.

98 E.g., *Inst. Iust.* 1.20.6; 1.22; see also Max Kaser, *Das Römische Privatrecht: Das Altrömische, das Vorklassische und Klassische Recht*, vol. 1. (Munich: Beck, 1971), 362–63.

99 *Inst. Iust.* 1.22; I note that there are several other ways for a tutelage to end, such as upon the fulfillment of a condition set by a testamentary tutelage (*Inst. Iust.* 1.22), or upon the death of the tutor or pupil (*Inst. Iust.* 1.22), however the details in Galatians still do not comport with Roman law since Paul indicates that the minor son's age of maturity is appointed by the Father.

100 Martyn, *Galatians*, 23.

101 See Peppard, *The Son of God*, 54–57; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 51–58.

102 See chapter 4 for a discussion of the specific practices of Roman and Greek adoption.

in Greco-Roman culture does not inherit until the Father's death, however this is to be expected when illustrating divine truths with human analogies.

Although Scott attempts to identify the ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος with the Egyptian slave masters, citing that they are not technical terms for members of a Greek or Roman household,¹⁰³ others have argued persuasively that these terms do in fact correspond to figures, such as guardians and estate administrators in a private household.¹⁰⁴ Within the New Testament ἐπίτροπος is used to refer to a steward or the manager of private affairs within a wealthy household (e.g., Matt 20:8; Luke 8:3). Similarly, Aristotle remarks, "All people rich enough to avoid personal trouble have a steward (ἐπίτροπος) who takes this office, while they themselves engage in politics and philosophy" (*Pol.* 1255b35–37). Likewise, οἰκονόμος can refer to a slave in a managerial position over an estate, such as the faithful and wise steward (ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος) in Luke 12:42. This meaning of οἰκονόμος is also attested by several inscriptions found throughout Asia Minor.¹⁰⁵ Although Scott is correct that ἐπίτροπος (guardian) and οἰκονόμος (overseer) are not technical terms *per se*, they are still appropriate and recognizable designations from the domestic sphere of Greco-Roman life. In light of this evidence,¹⁰⁶ Goodrich rightly concludes that ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόπους ἐστὶν καὶ οἰκονόμους (under guardians and overseers) "forms a hendiadys, emphasizing a single concept: the provisional authority placed over the minor."¹⁰⁷

The most troubling element of the metaphor's frame, regardless of whether one sees 4:1–7 as a retelling of the exodus event or as an example from a Greco-Roman household, is that Paul abruptly inserts υἰοθεσία into an analogy that ostensibly presupposed that the heir was the natural son of the Father. This is admittedly a difficult element of the analogy to explain by appealing to Greek or Roman customs, however it is not out of place in the larger context of Paul's understanding of sonship in Galatians. Throughout Galatians 3 Paul carefully

103 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 135–40.

104 E.g., Betz, *Galatians*, 203–204; Goodrich, "Guardians not Taskmasters," 265–73; Longenecker, *Galatians*, 162–64; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 62–63.

105 See e.g., Sencer Şahin, *Bithynische Studien* (Inschriften reichischer Städte aus Kleinasien 7, Bonn: Habelt, 1978), no. 12; Marijana Rici, "Varia Epigraphica," *EA* 35 (2002): 111; Thomas Corstan, "Zu Inschriften aus Kleinasien," *EA* 37 (2004): 112–13; Stephen Mitchell, *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II: The Ankara District, the Inscriptions of North Galatia* (British Institute of Archeology at Ankara Monograph 4, Oxford: B. A. R. 1982) nos. 34, and 324.

106 See also Goodrich's extensive documentation of the use of ἐπίτροπος and οἰκονόμος in both the public and private spheres ("Guardians not Taskmasters," 265–78).

107 *Ibid.*, 273.

constructs sonship around the promise of Christ as the seed, through whom the Galatians are named heirs of the promise and sons of Abraham. In Paul's argument, Abrahamic descent is squarely focused *on Christ* rather than on the Galatian believers, and Paul makes a christological argument for their incorporation (Gal 3:26–29), rather than appealing to their sharing of their characteristic “faith” with Abraham. Their faith is the means by which they participate in Christ and his sonship, thereby also participating in Abrahamic descent.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, a key component to Paul's argument throughout seems to be that sonship is bestowed through Christ, not inherited through natural descent or obtained through keeping the law. If this is the case, then despite the incongruity with the earlier part of his example, Paul's use of *υιοθεσία* fits quite well with his overall presentation of sonship when considered against the entire message of Galatians.

Model, Tenor, and Vehicle

As noted in chapter 2, this study will rely on Soskice's definition of a metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”¹⁰⁹ Soskice further defines the “one thing” as the metaphor's tenor and the “terms which are seen to be suggestive of another” as the vehicle.¹¹⁰ Therefore an integral part of the analysis for each chapter will be to delineate the tenor and vehicle of each metaphor in which *υιοθεσία* occurs. I also argued that a metaphor's vehicle evoked a model (or models), which are the concrete objects or states of affairs that provide the structure and mental simulation for the metaphorical vehicle. Therefore in each instance of a *υιοθεσία* metaphor it is necessary to determine the metaphor's tenor and vehicle, and examine which models (or models) are most likely to have been evoked and simulated. Furthermore, although there will seemingly be significant overlap between identifying the metaphor's proper frame and its tenor, model, and vehicle, it is necessary to consider each of these elements independently; theoretically, Scott's “frame” of a second exodus could be inappropriate but it could function as the tenor of the metaphor, or a Jewish model could underlie the metaphor even though the frame is more evocative of a Greco-Roman household. Thus, all possible options need to be considered for each part of the metaphor independently in order to arrive at the most robust understanding of how the component parts of a *υιοθεσία* metaphor function as a composite whole.

108 Bruce Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 133.

109 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

110 *Ibid.*, 45–51.

I will begin by identifying the vehicle and model since in Galatians 4:5 these are the simplest tasks. In the previous section the metaphorical utterance was identified as ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν (so that we might receive the adoption to sonship). Since the vehicle is a term present within the text,¹¹¹ in this text the vehicle is unquestionably υἰοθεσία. Thus in Gal 4:5 Paul is speaking about the tenor in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υἰοθεσία. However, the vehicle υἰοθεσία can evoke multiple models, and not all of the possible models are equally salient in every context, and so it is necessary to consider which models are most likely to be evoked and mentally simulated by this metaphor in Galatians 4:5.¹¹² As I described in chapter 4, there are three primary models for υἰοθεσία: Greek adoption, Roman adoption, and Jewish sonship/adoption.¹¹³ Scott has argued that this text should be read through the lens of Jewish adoption, primarily because, as discussed in the previous section, he sees Galatians 4:1–7 as an exodus typology rather than as an example from life in a Greco-Roman household. Scott argues that this text should be read with a model drawn from an Old Testament adoption metaphor, to the exclusion of all other models.¹¹⁴ Thus, according to Scott, the text in Galatians 4:5 is not drawing upon a Greco-Roman model of adoption, despite his equally fervent assertion that the conventional meaning of υἰοθεσία is “adoption,” and never “sonship.”¹¹⁵

If Soskice is correct in her suggestion that a vehicle can evoke more than one model,¹¹⁶ then Scott’s argument for a single model in Galatians 4:5 is already tenuous. Moreover, while Scott’s analysis does introduce a certain amount of coherence to the narrative of Galatians 4:1–7,¹¹⁷ ultimately his analysis of both

111 See Richards, *Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 96–99; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27–28; Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46.

112 See also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 47–51.

113 As I have noted, Scott’s argument for Jewish adoption rests on what he terms a Hebrew “adoption formula” which he sees at play in various texts in the Old Testament, but especially in 2 Sam 7:14 (*Adoption as Sons*, 61–120). However, it is by no means clear that Scott’s formula is equivalent to the Greco-Roman or Pauline uses of υἰοθεσία. For a more detailed discussion see chapter 4. Nevertheless, to fairly represent Scott’s central thesis I will use his terminology of “Jewish adoption” whenever I discuss his argument in the chapters that follow.

114 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 116–117, 267–70.

115 Ibid., 55; see also the discussion in chapter 4 regarding the conventional meaning of υἰοθεσία.

116 See chapter 2 for a discussion on vehicle and model.

117 This is not necessarily to say that Scott’s account of the narrative is convincing, but rather that his account of the narrative imports the structural coherence of the exodus and unifies Scott’s version of the story in Galatians 4:1–7.

the model and the frame of the υιοθεσία metaphor fails to address how the audience of the letter, which was predominantly, if not entirely, comprised of Galatian gentiles, would have understood the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5. As others have argued, it is quite possible to read Galatians 4:1–3 as an analogy drawn from a Greco-Roman household.¹¹⁸ Indeed, if Paul's audience was primarily gentile, then it is highly unlikely that they would be able to disassociate the Greco-Roman model even if they also associate models of Jewish sonship,¹¹⁹ particularly if they do not perceive the text through Scott's framework of a second exodus.

In contrast, it is far more likely that Paul's gentile audience in Galatia would have associated and mentally simulated a Roman model of adoption.¹²⁰ This is particularly true if the predominant evocation of the frame of the metaphor is of a situation in a Roman household, since adoption was a fairly common practice in the Roman context, and Imperial adoptions were widely broadcast to even the remote regions of the Empire. Moreover, because the metaphor occurs in the midst of a series of completed action verbs (ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἐξαγοράσθη) it is likely that υιοθεσία as a vehicle is particularly evocative of adoption as a *mode of entrance* into sonship. Hodge remarks that Galatians 4:5 describes "mythic, originary moments for gentiles-in-Christ."¹²¹ Stated differently, Paul's metaphor is perhaps more likely to evoke a model that connects the "making of sons" in the event of adoption to an action taken by the Father, which is the case both in Greco-Roman adoption and in Galatians 4:5. Indeed, the Father in Galatians 4:1–7 exhibit some characteristics typical of the *paterfamilias* of a Roman household, such as appointing guardians and overseers for his minor son, initiating the act of adoption, securing an heir, and so on. However, it is impossible to rule out any model entirely, and so the analysis below will proceed under the assumption that the Greco-Roman model is the one that was most likely to have been mentally simulated by the Galatian audience members, with the possibility that some audience members might also have associated Jewish sonship with the vehicle υιοθεσία.

118 See especially Goodrich, "Guardians not Taskmasters," 251–84.

119 Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42.

120 See chapter 4 for a discussion of the evidence for a Roman model of adoption; also noteworthy here is Kunst's demonstration that there was no uniform terminology, but rather a variety of "adoption formulae" in Roman adoption practices (*Römische Adoption*, 14).

121 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 77. Pace Hodge, I would argue that υιοθεσία in Gal 4:5 pertains to all believers, both Jew and gentile, however Hodge's point about υιοθεσία as an "originary moment" is precisely correct.

While identifying the metaphor's vehicle is fairly straightforward, delineating the metaphor's tenor presents a more complex matter. Recall also that while the tenor is the metaphor's subject, it is not adequate to speak of the tenor "stripped of its vehicle" rendering *υιοθεσία* as a metaphor *for X*.¹²² The three most likely candidates for the tenor in Galatians 4:5 are: (1) Paul is speaking about the "second exodus" in which the collective Israel receives sonship/adoption through the Christ-event, (2) Paul is speaking about "salvation" in terms of adoption, (3) or Paul is speaking about God's mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms of adoption. Although options two and three look similar, the following analysis will show that the third formulation of the tenor is preferable.

If we were to take the first tenor, the metaphor would be rendered "speaking about the second exodus in terms which are seen to be suggestive of *υιοθεσία*." If Scott were using metaphor theory, this would likely be his formulation since he argues that the first half of Gal 4:1–7 "refers to the redemption from bondage in Egypt and the *υιοθεσία* of Israel at the time of the Exodus," and the second half "probably refers to the eschatological redemption (*ἐξαγοράζειν*) and *υιοθεσία* expected in the messianic time (vv. 3–7)."¹²³ However, we have already seen that it is unlikely that the singular *ὁ κληρονόμος* refers to the collective of Israel, which means that it is also unlikely that *υιοθεσία* refers to the collective Israel receiving adoption either implicitly in verses 1–2, or explicitly in the second exodus Scott identifies in verses 3–7. Moreover, even if the tenor of the metaphor is the second exodus, Scott ultimately fails to show how this subject relates either to the message of Galatians as a whole, or to Paul's audience of Galatian gentiles.

Although the second option reflects the majority consensus, it is problematic for the approach I have taken for analyzing metaphors because it replaces one metaphor (*υιοθεσία*) with another (salvation). It is almost customary to speak of *υιοθεσία* as a metaphor "for salvation." Indeed, Burke remarks, "there has been an increasing awareness and appreciation among systematicians and New Testament scholars that *huiiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the apostle Paul."¹²⁴ Of any of the occurrences of *υιοθεσία* in the Pauline corpus, the text in Galatians 4:5 is perhaps the only text where speaking of "salvation" in terms suggestive of *υιοθεσία* might be appropriate, given the text's strong emphasis on the divine action of the Father's sending of

122 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 48–49. See chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of the tenor and vehicle.

123 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 149.

124 Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 37–38.

the Son on behalf of believers. However, despite the fact that scholars prefer and utilize the vocabulary of “salvation” or “soteriological metaphors” to speak about a range of metaphors in Paul (e.g., justification, redemption, reconciliation, etc.), it is also true that “salvation” has its own set of Pauline texts where it is used metaphorically (e.g., Rom 1:16; 10:1; 11:11; 13:11; 2 Cor 1:6; 6:2; 7:10; Phil 1:28; 2:12; 1 Thess 5:8).¹²⁵ Despite its popularity as a shorthand designation for a diverse collection of Pauline metaphors, “salvation” is not a specific or precise enough tenor to fully articulate the various dimensions of the text in Galatians 4:1–7. Therefore, for clarity’s sake in analyzing the metaphor in Galatians 4:5, I propose a slightly more cumbersome, but less “metaphorical” tenor for the *υιοθεσία* metaphor.

Rather than speaking of “salvation” in terms suggestive of *υιοθεσία*, I propose to render the tenor of the metaphor as “God’s mission to bring believers into relationship with himself.” At first blush this sounds quite similar to “salvation,” however it is preferable to remove a term which itself is such a central biblical metaphor (*σωτηρία*) and substitute instead a tenor with a non-metaphorical construction.¹²⁶ Moreover, constructing the tenor in terms of mission and relationship highlights the primary thrust of the text, which is undoubtedly the mission of the Son who was sent by the Father. This mission is, in Martyn’s words, “an invasion of cosmic scope,”¹²⁷ which reflects Paul’s certainty that God’s mission will not only save individuals, but will transform the whole of creation, ending humanity’s enslavement not only to the law, but to the very foundation of creation (*στοιχία τοῦ κόσμου*/elemental forces of the world) in the present age. With this emphasis on mission being highlighted in the construction of the tenor, the metaphor in Galatians 4:5 would be rendered, “that figure of speech whereby we speak about God’s mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption.”

125 I would also point out here that “salvation” has become so engrained in the vocabulary of biblical studies that it might be tempting to object that it is not a metaphorical term (see chapter 2 for a discussion on living and dead metaphors). However, Paul also uses *σωτηρία* in Phil 1:19 in a conventional context, which is typically translated “deliverance,” presumably because of the theological freight that “salvation” carries.

126 By offering this paraphrase of the tenor I am not suggesting that we get at the “meaning” of the metaphor via this nonmetaphorical construction, since “meaning” is also tied up in the metaphor’s mental simulation. Rather, my goal in identifying the tenor is to try to elucidate how this metaphorical utterance fits within the larger framework of Paul’s message in Galatians. I also acknowledge that terms like “mission” and “relationship” have a framework of cognitive metaphors of their own, but I would argue that these are less lively metaphors than “salvation” is (or at least should be).

127 Martyn, *Galatians*, 408.

Emphasis and Resonance

Most scholars recognize that Paul's choice of υιοθεσία in Galatians 4:5 is a striking departure from the example he has set up in verses 1–3,¹²⁸ however it is perhaps less clear whether the metaphor in Galatians 4:5 qualifies as emphatic and resonant under Black's classification of metaphors identified in my second chapter.¹²⁹ A metaphor is emphatic "to the degree that its producer will allow no variation upon or substitute for the words used."¹³⁰ It is widely acknowledged that υιοθεσία was not a well-worn metaphor in the first century,¹³¹ and I further suggested that because of its relative scarcity, each of the New Testament uses of υιοθεσία likely maintains a high degree of novelty.¹³² In the context of Galatians 4:1–7, the υιοθεσία metaphor is emphatic both because of its relative scarcity and because υιοθεσία, for most of Paul's audience, would have evoked such a specific model for mental simulation (particularly the Roman model) for the mode of entrance into sonship. Given Paul's example of the νήπιος (underage child) in verses 1–3, one might have expected him to say that the Son redeemed those under the law so that they might receive their inheritance as sons, or so that they might be deemed adult sons. Instead, Paul speaks of time that has not "ripened of its own accord,"¹³³ but rather one that is of the Father's own sovereign choosing. Paul's choice of υιοθεσία communicates that the *Son's mission* rather than the heirs reaching the age of majority on their own accord, resulted in the believers' adoption to sonship. Paul's departure from the structure he sets up in his example of the underage heir suggests that he chooses υιοθεσία in verse 5 precisely because any potential variant or substitute could not communicate the distinct emphasis of υιοθεσία on sonship. Therefore, in this context the metaphor containing υιοθεσία is emphatic, as evidenced by both the abrupt shift in Paul's original example and the level of specificity communicated by υιοθεσία as a mode of entrance into sonship.

While it is fairly evident that the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is emphatic, its level of resonance is a more complicated question. According to Black a metaphor is resonant to the extent that it will support "a high degree of implicative elaboration."¹³⁴ There are several factors in Galatians 4:5 that

128 Martyn remarks, "The legal custom portrayed by Paul in vv. 1–2 leaves no place for the motif of adoption" (Ibid., 386).

129 See chapter 2.

130 Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.

131 See e.g., Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 37–41, and Dunn, *Galatians*, 217.

132 See chapter 2 for a discussion on novelty.

133 Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 270–71.

134 Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.

suggest the υιοθεσία metaphor is constrained to a smaller implicative elaboration. First, the example of the underage heir in verses 1–3 is tightly focused on the relationship of the heir to the father, the heir’s minority, and the status of the heir who has reached majority as appointed by the Father. The believers have been incorporated into Christ as sons of God through faith, and apart from the law both Jews and gentiles are heirs of the promised inheritance.¹³⁵ It is also worth noting that these elements are “vertical elements,” meaning that they are all elements that impinge upon the believer’s relationship with God. However, as the discussion above revealed, the shifting pronouns throughout verses 1–7 make it somewhat difficult to identify the precise group to whom υιοθεσία applies, which may have moderately weakened the vertical elements present in the implicative complex because the audience may have had difficulty identifying themselves as the referent. In addition, because Paul chooses to outline a few specific implications, such as the relationship with the Father and the link between adoption and the status of “heir,” the metaphor’s other possible implications that are not overtly mentioned in the text (e.g., the horizontal relationships between audience members) are probably not as prominent for most audience members. Therefore, although the metaphor is quite emphatic, its resonance is limited to the vertical elements Paul chooses to include in the context, which in this case function as constraints to the implicative complex of the metaphor. Moreover, it is likely that his audience members identified themselves as the referent of the υιοθεσία metaphor and thus saw themselves participants in these vertical elements,¹³⁶ though it is possible that Paul’s ambiguous pronouns weakened these connections for some of his hearers/readers.

Metaphor and Audience

Having established the parameters and fleshed out the features of the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 as a literary feature of the text of Galatians in the previous section of this chapter, I will now direct the analysis beyond the text and toward what Richards terms the “intercourse of thoughts,” that is, toward an examination of the metaphor’s effect on cognition, perception, emotion, and identity. In chapter 3 I argued that metaphors were powerful, constructive agents that had tremendous potential for creating particular conceptions of a particular subject through mental simulation, and for creating intimate

¹³⁵ Belleville, ““Under Law,”” 61.

¹³⁶ See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 93–119.

bonds between an author and the hearers/readers of a metaphor. Moreover, I argued that metaphors can become symbols of identity within a particular community by creating bonds between community members and constructing boundaries between members and outsiders. The analysis below will treat each of these areas that the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 might have influenced, highlighting the key ways the metaphor might have shaped the perceptions, emotions, and identity of Paul's gentile audience in Galatia.

Metaphor and Perception

I argued above that the primary implications of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 were the specific "vertical implications" that Paul develops in verses 1–7. Here I will argue that these vertical implications provide the audience with a correlated mental simulation and cognitive structure that Paul attaches to a particular event in the community's history: the reception of the Spirit. As Betz remarks, "In terms of the phenomenology of religion, the ecstatic experience of the Spirit should be called 'objective' evidence, and this coincides with Paul's argumentation, while the concept of sonship is a matter of 'subjective' self-understanding."¹³⁷ Although Betz perhaps overstates his case a bit by calling the reception of the Spirit "objective evidence," he is right to point out that the event of receiving the Spirit was mutually recognized common ground between Paul and his Galatian audience. Paul has already referred to the reception of the Spirit in order to dissuade the Galatians from taking upon themselves the yoke of the law (Gal 3:2), and in chapter 4 he again appeals to their experience of the Spirit as the basis for their sonship. In connecting the Galatians' experience of receiving the Spirit with his *υιοθεσία* metaphor, Paul is nudging the audience to perceive this experience "actively and recreatively," and the metaphor functions to "compose it, to make sense of it,"¹³⁸ through the correlated mental simulation of *υιοθεσία*.

In Galatians 4:5 the cognitive structure Paul erects through the *υιοθεσία* metaphor provides a lens for the actions of all three members of the Trinity.¹³⁹ In this passage, the Father is the subject of each verb that describes God's mission, but his mission is carried out through the actions of the Son's mission

¹³⁷ Betz, *Galatians*, 210.

¹³⁸ Lanham, *Analyzing Prose*, 3.

¹³⁹ I am aware that the term "Trinity" might be deemed anachronistic. However, Galatians 4 is arguably one of the earliest collocations of the three members of the Christian godhead, and has long been recognized as a key passage for the later construction of the doctrine; see also Aranda, "Imagen de Dios en Cristo," 605, 611–15; Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiiothesia," 116–36; Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 72.

that makes Jews and gentiles alike sons of the Father, whose identity as sons and heirs is confirmed by the testimony of the Spirit of God.¹⁴⁰ In Galatians 4, the Father's initiative, the Son's mission, and the Spirit's testimony are all processed through the cognitive structure created by the mental simulation of the υιοθεσία metaphor. In this way, υιοθεσία is the new existential condition of the believer, wrought by the will of the Father, the mission of the Son, and lived by the power and testimony of the Spirit.¹⁴¹ In addition, the υιοθεσία metaphor provides the cognitive structure that enables the believers to see themselves as heirs and descendants of Abraham, which, of course, is a key component to Paul's argument throughout Galatians 3 and 4 (3:7, 14, 25–29; 4:5–7, 28–31). Each of these components will be outlined in further detail below, in order to more fully illuminate the cognitive framework constructed by υιοθεσία in the context of Galatians 4:1–7.

The Father is perhaps the most prominent figure throughout Galatians 4:1–7. He appears in Paul's example in verses 1–3 as the authority over the heir who is responsible for setting the point of transition for His son's adulthood (Gal 4:2), though arguably in verses 1–2 the father could refer to any human father. However, it is clear in verse 4 that God the Father is in view (ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν ἀποστού/the father sent his son) and verse 6 explicitly identifies God as Αββὰ ὁ πατήρ. Correspondingly, the cognitive structure created by Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor draws the actions of the Father into sharp relief. Through the cognitive structure of the υιοθεσία metaphor, Paul's audience would have constructed a mental simulation wherein the Father is the initiator of their relationship with the members of the Trinity. Martyn remarks, "In the context of this new family the word 'Father' is thereby redefined on the basis of *God's* identity."¹⁴² In the context of Galatians 4:1–7 the Father is revealed as the one who sets the appointed time, and who sends the Son. In turn, the significance of the Father's role is only recognized in retrospect, through the believer's comprehension of what the Son's mission has accomplished.¹⁴³ The composite picture of the Father constructed by Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 shows the Father as the initiator of relationship with the believers, which is accomplished through the sending of his Son. Moreover, the Spirit testifies to the Father's actions in the cry, Αββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

140 Fee, *Galatians*, 148.

141 "Υιοθεσία is the new existential condition of the Christian, willed by the Father, implemented by the mission of the Son, and lived in the Spirit" (Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiiothesia," 106).

142 Martyn, *Galatians*, 387.

143 De Boer, *Galatians*, 262.

In connection with the believers' adoption, the *'abbā* prayer attributed to the Spirit grounds the believers' sonship in their tangible experience of receiving the Spirit. Thus, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 creates the perception for Paul's audience that their reception of the Spirit is evidence of their relationship with God the Father. Furthermore, the underlying models and intertextual connections reinforce the actions that Paul explicitly mentions in the text. Greek and Roman practices of adoption are initiated and carried out under the authority of the Father, which accords very well with the characteristics of the Father in Galatians 4:1–7. Texts from the Old Testament record YHWH as the Father who consistently pursued a relationship with his covenant people. Therefore, by evoking these models and intertextual connections, *υιοθεσία* in Galatians 4:5 creates a cognitive structure in which the Father initiates and carries out the formation of an intimate relationship with his sons, which Paul connects to their tangible experience of receiving the Spirit.

The believers' adoption in Galatians 4 is also plainly connected with the mission of the Son. Although it is the Father who sends the Son, the Son is the active agent in Galatians 4:4, who takes on flesh (*γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*/born of a woman) and the yoke of the law (*γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον*/born under the law). The two *ἵνα* clauses, whether they are read as purpose or result, indicate the effect of the Son's mission upon the believers, which was to secure the redemption of both Jews and gentiles.¹⁴⁴ The mental simulation likely evoked by the *υιοθεσία* metaphor creates the perception that the Son is the agent who effected adoption to sonship by his gracious action of interchange.¹⁴⁵ James Dunn remarks, "What is set in contrast . . . is the ordinary humanness of God's Son in his mission, and the adoption of ordinary human beings to divine sonship."¹⁴⁶ Through the lens of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor, Paul urges the believers in Galatia to view their adoptive sonship through the accomplished mission of the Son.

Galatians 4:4–5 makes clear that the mission of the Son is the efficient cause for the believers' adoption, though it is also worth noting that in this passage Paul does not communicate *how* the Son accomplished this mission; his death and resurrection are noticeably absent.¹⁴⁷ This point is a matter of

144 It is unwise to draw too fine a distinction between purpose and result in Koine Greek, "in many cases purpose and result cannot be clearly differentiated, and hence *ἵνα* is used for the result that follows according to the purpose of the subj. or of God" (BDAG, 378).

145 See also Morna D. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 59–60.

146 Dunn, *Galatians*, 215.

147 On this point see Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 101–102.

debate among interpreters, with some, such as Betz, arguing that there is a “discrepancy” between the christological formulations in 3:13–14¹⁴⁸ and 4:4–5 that “cannot be harmonized,”¹⁴⁹ since in 3:13 Christ becomes a “curse” on the cross and in 4:4–5 it is the Son’s *life* under the law that is in view. However, Hays argues that 3:13–14 and 4:3–6 “fit together like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle to form a single coherent story line.”¹⁵⁰ Hays correctly continues, “[I]t is unthinkable to read the christological formulation in 4:4–5 without recognizing that here also Paul certainly presupposes Christ’s death as the central action in the gospel story, although he does not explicitly mention it.”¹⁵¹ In light of Hays’s observation, it is also true that the cognitive structure created by the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is grounded in the life and death of Son, thereby creating a strong perception of connection and identification with the Son as the adoptive sons participate in the divine “interchange.”¹⁵²

Paul further undergirds the Son’s connection with the believers’ adoption by indicating that the Spirit the believers received is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ. By connecting the Son’s mission to both υἱοθεσία and the reception of the Spirit, Paul constructs a cognitive framework that allows the audience to perceive their reception of the Spirit in terms of their own adoption brought about by the Son’s mission. The sonship of the Galatian believers is therefore evidenced by their experience of the Spirit, which God sent through his Son into their hearts.¹⁵³ Thus, like the Father’s sending, the Son’s mission is inextricably linked with their experience of the Spirit and their perception of themselves as adopted sons of God.

Though the Spirit is not mentioned until verse 6 of Paul’s example of sonship, the entire example hinges upon the Spirit’s role in the believers’ υἱοθεσία. As I have already argued, Paul is using the audience’s experience of the Spirit to ground his υἱοθεσία metaphor, and thus it is crucial for Paul that his audience connects the reception of the Spirit with the initiative of the Father and the mission of the Son to bring about their adoption to sonship. Their reception of

148 Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα . . . ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλογία τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ γένηται ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως/Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse on our behalf . . . so that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the gentiles, so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

149 Betz, *Galatians*, 207 n. 51. Betz continues, “How these two passages relate to each other doctrinally and historically is difficult to say” (*Galatians*, 207 n. 51).

150 Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 109.

151 Ibid.

152 Hooker, *From Adam to Christ*, 59–60.

153 De Boer, *Galatians*, 265.

the Spirit forms the crux of Paul's argument in Galatians 4:1–7, since it is the believers' experience of the Spirit that grounds their identity as sons, and confirms that Paul is right and that the agitators are wrong.¹⁵⁴ The precise element which constructs the cognitive framework of the υιοθεσία metaphor around the experience of the Spirit as evidence of the believers' sonship is the ὅτι clause at the beginning of verse 6. The causal clause signals the audience members to interpret the reception of the Spirit occurring *as a result of their adoption*. In addition, the Spirit testifies to the involvement of the other two members of the Trinity, as Paul names the Spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ (the Spirit of his Son), and declares that the Father sent the Spirit into their hearts. Moreover, the declaration is placed in the mouth of the Spirit, who cries out Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ ('abbā, Father) in the heart of the believer. Thus the Spirit is both the foundation for the cognitive framework of the υιοθεσία metaphor and the key element in confirming and testifying to the believers' identity as sons and heirs of God. The cognitive framework constructed by the υιοθεσία metaphor evokes a mental simulation that intimately involves all three members of the Trinity in the adoption of the believers. This framework is built upon the audience's experience of the Spirit which Paul here interprets for his audience through the framework of υιοθεσία. It is crucial to note that Paul does not assume that their experience of the Spirit is self-interpreting,¹⁵⁵ but rather he uses it to ground the υιοθεσία metaphor in order to create a particular perception of the experience for his audience members.

Highlighting and Hiding

I argued in chapter 3 that the cognitive structure a metaphor creates is not a neutral conduit of information, but rather it functions as a particular lens for the metaphor's tenor, highlighting some features while hiding others.¹⁵⁶ In the exegesis of a metaphor, it is thus necessary to consider what features of the tenor the metaphor brings to the fore, and perhaps even more significantly, which elements the metaphor is potentially suppressing. In the case of Galatians 4:5, these elements are perhaps best considered in light of two other major themes of the letter: (1) the faithfulness and sufficiency of Christ, and (2) the true children of God. Working in support of these two themes, the υιοθεσία metaphor highlights the Son's divine mission that accomplishes the adoption of the Galatian believers, and the sufficiency of this mission to create sons and

¹⁵⁴ Fee, *Galatians*, 151.

¹⁵⁵ See Fowl, "Who Can Read Abraham's Story," 79.

¹⁵⁶ See chapter 3; see also Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 142; Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, 39.

heirs of God apart from works of the law (3:2). Conversely, the metaphor hides the primacy of Abraham and the law for obtaining sonship of God, and therefore full acceptance into the community, which was presumably at least part of the message of Paul's opponents.¹⁵⁷

Galatians 4:4–5 stands as the theological center of the pericope. These verses succinctly summarize the Son's mission to bring people out of bondage and into the adoption to sonship of the Father. In these verses, the mission of the Son is shown to be the fulfillment of God's redemptive activity on behalf of humanity.¹⁵⁸ The emphasis of these verses rests squarely on the Son's actions, initiated by the Father, and therefore highlights the Son's faithfulness and obedience in carrying out the mission of adoption. Despite the fact that Paul's christological formulation in Galatians 4:5 does not specifically mention the cross, nevertheless his statement evokes the whole of the Christ story by making mention of a single part.¹⁵⁹ Thus the mention of the Son's birth under the law (γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον) for the purpose of redeeming those under the law (ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ) in 4:4–5 also creates a cognitive framework that highlights the Son's death on the cross that forms an integral part of Paul's argument in the preceding chapters (e.g., Gal 2:19; 3:1; 3:13–14). Therefore, what is highlighted through the Father's sending of the Son to bring about the υἱοθεσία of believers in 4:5 is that the Son "died faithfully for human beings while looking faithfully to God."¹⁶⁰

The dire situation of the Galatian believers is also highlighted through the use of the slavery metaphor, further emphasizing the radical change in position accomplished by the Son.¹⁶¹ Kahl's detailed analysis of the background of Galatians further fleshes out the possible connotations "slavery" might have had for the Galatian gentiles, who at this point had a long history of enslavement and subjugation under the Roman empire, and who now lived in an uneasy, rigidly maintained peace with Rome.¹⁶² In light of their background,

157 See also John M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Vancouver: Regent College Publications, 2005), 52–54; G. Walter Hansen, *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts* (JSNTSup 29, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 167–74; Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham's God*, 128–34; J. Louis Martyn, "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians," *SJT* 38.3 (1985): 317–23; Martyn, *Galatians*, 294–306, 343–44, 432–57.

158 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 170.

159 See Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 109.

160 Martyn, *Galatians*, 271.

161 Adolf Schlatter, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon* (Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 7, Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963), 106.

162 Kahl, *Galatians Re-imagined*, 169–204.

the mental simulations associated with “slavery” would likely have been vivid. In Galatians 4:5, Paul’s use of ἐξαγοράζειν connotes “the purchasing of a slave in order to free him.”¹⁶³ In addition, Galatians 4:1–3 brings to the fore that the Galatians’ former state of slavery entails being “subject as a slave to an alien will,”¹⁶⁴ and existing in the “state or condition of being held as chattel by another.”¹⁶⁵ However, the Galatian believers would not have thought in abstract descriptions of slavery; they knew the sights, smells, and sounds of slavery firsthand, and this is what their brains would have simulated when making meaning from Paul’s words. Furthermore, when ἡμεθα δεδουλωμένοι (we were enslaved) is used in combination with τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (the elements of the world) (Gal 4:3), and τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς (the things by nature that were not gods) Gal 4:8), the idea Paul communicates is one of absolute obedience, and more specifically, obedience under compulsion. The bleak situation of humanity communicated through the slavery metaphors serves to highlight the believers’ adoption as the “cosmic change enacted by God”¹⁶⁶ and carried out through the initiative of the Father through the Son’s faithful death. Through the use of the slavery and υἱοθεσία metaphors in Galatians 4:1–9 Paul draws clearly into view the successful mission of the Son to bring them into relationship with the Father.

An attendant and significant attribute that the υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights is the *sufficiency* of the Son’s mission to effect the adoption of believers apart from works of the law; this is true whether or not one affirms all or any part of the New Perspective view of ἔργα νόμου (works of the law). For example, if one takes a “Lutheran” approach to “works of law,” then the function of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is to highlight that believers attain sonship not by their own merit, or by keeping the law, but rather they receive sonship as a gift from the Father, brought about by Christ, and testified to by the Spirit.¹⁶⁷ This is evident in Paul’s contrast between the Son’s active “redeeming” of those under the law and the description of the Galatian believers as those who “receive the adoption to sonship” (ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν). Representative of the Lutheran view, Hansen comments that according to Paul, “We could do nothing to attain to the position of sons and daughters; we can only receive the gift

163 Dunn, *Galatians*, 216.

164 TDNT, 2:261.

165 BDAG, 259.

166 Martyn, *Galatians*, 271.

167 See especially Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The Lutheran Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 22–41, 297–340.

of adoption.”¹⁶⁸ Thus, if read within a Lutheran framework, the metaphor highlights that it is entirely the action of the Son that brings about the deliverance of those ὑπὸ νόμον (under the law).

Moreover, as advocates of the New Perspective claim, if “works of the law” refers to the established boundary markers around the Jews as an ethnic people, then the υἱοθεσία metaphor is highlighting other key elements as well.¹⁶⁹ Given Paul’s wording in verses 4–5 and his choice of υἱοθεσία, there is little question that he desires to emphasize that sonship is bestowed at the initiative of the Father through the mission of the Son. If, as advocates of the New Perspective argue, the works of the law are boundary markers, then the cognitive framework created by υἱοθεσία highlights for Paul’s audience that God has bypassed ethnic boundaries to make sons apart from any ethnic ties. If this is the case, then Paul’s υἱοθεσία metaphor might also highlight that sonship is bestowed by the will of the Father and not inherited through ethnicity or through keeping the law as a member of the covenant community. In support of this point Martyn argues, “[T]his corporate people is determined to no degree at all by the religious and ethnic factors that characterized the old creation,” but rather “is determined solely by incorporation into the Christ in whom those factors have no real existence.”¹⁷⁰ Martyn’s point regarding ethnicity needs to be tempered slightly as υἱοθεσία as a model does not connote the obliteration of ethnic distinctions,¹⁷¹ but it does render them no longer salient, and subordinates them to the new familial relationships created through adoption. Therefore, rather than asserting that ethnicity plays no factor, I would argue that Paul’s υἱοθεσία metaphor highlights the sufficiency of Christ to bring about adoption over and against ethnic barriers.

If the metaphor draws attention to the sufficiency of the Son’s mission and the Father’s initiation of a relationship with the believers, then by extension it hides any notion that sonship comes through Abraham and law observance. Presumably the agitators were preaching law observance as a stipulation of belonging to Abraham’s descendants,¹⁷² and already in Galatians 3 Paul

168 Hansen, *Galatians*, 120.

169 See N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), vol. 1, 354–75; James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 121–40, 213–226, 381–94, 413–28; see also N. T. Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 21–39.

170 Martyn, *Galatians*, 382.

171 See chapter 4 for a discussion on the relationship between Greek and Roman adoption and previous familial and ethnic ties.

172 See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 113–14; Martyn, *Galatians*, 302–306.

subverts ethnic connections to Abraham by arguing that the sons of Abraham are οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (the ones from faith) (3:7). This phrase is sometimes treated as equivalent to οἱ πιστεύοντες (the believers), or as Schlier explains, “οἱ ἐκ πίστεως hat einen umfassenden Sinn: es sind die Menschen, die in der πίστις [faith] die Grundweise ihres Lebens haben, deren Lebensprinzip die Pistis ist,”¹⁷³ which is to say that πίστις [faith] is a religious disposition. However, in addition to being a religious disposition, the designation οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (the ones from faith) picks out a particular group—the sons of Abraham—who also partake in the blessing that Abraham received, on account of their participation in Christ.¹⁷⁴ Moreover, the gentile Galatians do not receive this blessing because they have faith “like faithful Abraham,” but because they have been incorporated into the singular “seed” of Abraham, which is Christ (3:16). Indeed, the gentile Christians in Paul’s audience have no direct relationship or genealogical connection to Abraham; their relationship to Abraham is entirely dependent upon their incorporation into Christ, who is Abraham’s seed.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, it is by virtue of sharing first in Christ’s sonship that they share also in the lesser sonship of Abraham (3:29).¹⁷⁶ By reversing the “expected order” presumably promulgated by the agitators from the “sons of Abraham” being the “sons of God,” to the “sons of God through faith” (3:26) who “belong to Christ” sharing also in the designation “seed of Abraham” (3:29), Paul highlights the primacy of the believers’ sonship through God and hides any ethnic undertones in Abrahamic sonship.

Further undermining the agitators’ message, the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians bypasses Abraham altogether by directly linking the believers’ sonship to the Father’s adoption of them. By receiving adoption, which is confirmed by their experience of the Spirit, the Galatian believers partake in Christ’s ancestry.¹⁷⁷ Thus the cognitive framework constructed by the υἱοθεσία metaphor brings the actions of the Father, Son, and Spirit to the forefront of the mind while hiding the Jewish paradigm of sonship coming through Abraham and law observance. As Becker observes, Paul’s illustrations here

173 Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KEK 7, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128.

174 Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 172; see also Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 79–91.

175 Hendrikus Boers, *Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness* (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 81. N. b. Boers maintains that Abraham’s faith is, in some sense, faith in Christ. I side more with Richard Hays who sees τῷ πιστῷ Ἀβραάμ as foreshadowing πίστις Χριστοῦ who is the “one heir of the promise” (*Faith of Jesus Christ*, 180).

176 Dunn, *Galatians*, 214.

177 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 76.

are not random, “sondern ist konstitutiv für die Polemik gegen die Irrlehrer.”¹⁷⁸ Furthermore, Paul’s negative portrayal of the law as an enslaving element, and specifying that the Son was sent ἵνα τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (in order to redeem those under the law) further distances sonship from law observance. Thus Paul uses the υἱοθεσία metaphor in conjunction with the portrayal of the law as an enslaving power to create the perception that sonship comes upon redemption *from* the law as an enslaving power, and that the sons of God are sons through their adoption by the Father, who makes them heirs *through* God apart from law observance.

Metaphor and Emotion

In chapter 3 I argued that metaphors not only affect cognition by subtly influencing the perception of their hearers or readers, but they also have the potential to arouse emotional responses from their audience, particularly when the metaphor is both emphatic and resonant. The aim of a metaphor-maker is not only to alter the way his or her audience *thinks* about a particular subject, but also to alter the way he or she *feels* about a particular subject.¹⁷⁹ Indeed, the affective potential of a metaphor is equally important as its cognitive content in respect to its ability to create a particular vision of its subject, as both are wrapped up in the mental simulation of an audience member. Therefore, in the exegesis of the metaphor in Galatians 4:5, one must consider what affective or emotional responses Paul is aiming to stimulate from his audience members through his υἱοθεσία metaphor. I argued in chapter 3 that persuasive metaphors achieve this by functioning as mini-narratives that draw their readers/hearers into them as participants in their stories.¹⁸⁰ As participants, the audience identifies with the characters and their attendant emotions. Thus below I will trace the contours of the narrative world Paul invites his readers/hearers to enter, and identify several of the most prominent emotions that he invites his readers to experience. Within the text, these emotions will be identified using Kövecses’ root metaphors of emotion which I will show to underlie Paul’s narrative in Galatians 4:1–7.

However, it is also important to note that Paul’s example in Galatians 4:1–7 is not terribly fraught with emotionally charged language,¹⁸¹ nor is his exposition of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 4:5 as laden with emotion as its parallel expression in Romans 8:15, where the frame of the metaphor is arguably much more

¹⁷⁸ Becker, “Der Brief and die Galater,” 47.

¹⁷⁹ Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 23.

¹⁸⁰ See chapter 3.

¹⁸¹ See Longenecker, *Galatians*, 173–75.

emotionally charged.¹⁸² Paul's tone in 4:4–5, which, if not taken from another source, is at least reminiscent of a creed, and perhaps does not lend itself as naturally to emotional expression, though the image of υἱοθεσία certainly communicates intimacy and belonging. Moreover, unlike Romans 8:15 where the believer is the subject of the emotional exclamation Αββα ὁ πατήρ (*abbā*, Father), in Galatians 4:5 the Spirit is the one who cries out and proclaims the believer's identity. I would suggest that Paul's attribution of the *abbā* cry to the Spirit in Galatians 4:5 was intentional and strategic as it connects the believers' sonship directly to the testimony of the Spirit, but I also must acknowledge this same attribution possibly lessens the emotional response of the audience since their hearts are not the subjects of the verb.

Although the verses in Galatians 4:1–7 are not laden with emotionally charged language, they do present a detailed narrative world to the audience members. Moreover, in a few short verses the audience is presented with several complex characters that provide avenues through which the audience members participate in the narrative and experience the emotions brought about by their mental simulations of the scenario Paul describes. These characters include: the minor son, the slave, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. Paul's example in verses 1–2 invites his audience to view themselves as the minor son of the Father who is kept in the custody of guardians and overseers (ἐπιτρόπους καὶ οἰκονόμους). Moreover, the audience members are told that this son is “no different than a slave (οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου).” The audience members' identification with the character of the minor son is then explicitly reinforced by Paul's statement “so also we, when we were minors, were enslaved under the elemental forces of the world (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἦμεθα δεδουλωμένοι).” Here the minor son and the slave blend together, and the audience is invited to view themselves as both slaves and minor sons being held in custody and existing in a state of slavery. Thus, the narrative world into which Paul invites his audience is one where the audience members exist both as minor sons under the guardianship of guardians and overseers, and one in which they are enslaved to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (elemental forces of the world).

Into this world of slavery, the Father initiates a plan of redemption. The character of the Father is present as a careful planner who has orchestrated the plan of redemption for his sons and heirs (ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας/until the appointed time). In order to bring the minor son/slaves out of their state of slavery, the Father sends his Son into the same state of slavery. Thus Paul's

182 This will be argued in detail in the following chapter which treats the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 23.

audience is moved to recognize the Father's "beneficially invasive presence and activity whereby God liberates human beings from slavery."¹⁸³ Moreover, when the audience participates in the narrative through simulating the actions of the character of the Father, they likely experience the narrative from the perspective of an observer rather than a participant because the narrative utilizes third-person aorist verbs to describe the Father's actions.¹⁸⁴ Simulating the Father's sending of the Son as a completed action may place more emphasis on the aspects of the Father's sacrifice and loss, and lead the audience members to a greater appreciation of the Father's great expense to redeem the minor sons/slaves.

The character of the Son is portrayed as an obedient agent who carries out his Father's will. He willingly enters into the same state of slavery as the minor sons and slaves of verses 1–2, taking on the full weight of both humanity and the law (γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον/born of a woman, born under the law). In this respect, the Son is the *telos* and the center of God's redemptive activity in the cosmos.¹⁸⁵ According to the text, the Son is purposeful in his mission to redeem the enslaved, so that the former slaves might receive the adoption to sonship and be counted as sons alongside the Son. Observing the actions of the Son from the perspective of an observer, the audience may experience gratitude for the Son's self-sacrifice, and a greater appreciation of the dire situation of their own position as minor sons/slaves into sharp relief. Indeed, the slaves and minor sons are so thoroughly entrenched in their position of slavery that only the Son's successful mission can bring about their redemption. Moreover, it is likely that Paul's audience would have identified closely with the sacrificial mission of the Son since Paul has already called them to be crucified with Christ (2:19), and be baptized with Christ (3:27), and to clothe themselves with Christ (3:27).

The character of the Spirit plays a supporting role in the narrative, and is only mentioned explicitly in verse 6. The primary role of the Spirit is to testify to the success of the Son's mission and to the new identity of the slaves/minor sons. Longenecker remarks that the purpose of the Spirit is "to witness to the filial relation of the believer with God that has been established by the work of Christ—a witness both to the believer (so 3:2, 5) and to God the Father (so here [in 4:6])."¹⁸⁶ However, I would argue that Longenecker inserts a false dichotomy into the role of the Spirit in 3:2–5 and 4:6. Although the Spirit is

183 De Boer, *Galatians*, 266.

184 See Bergen, *Louder than Words*, 108–119.

185 Longenecker, *Galatians*, 170.

186 *Ibid.*, 174.

testifying to the Father in 4:6, as participants in the narrative Paul's audience also witnesses the Spirit's testimony of their filial relationship with the Father, even though the testimony is not directed toward them. Moreover, the Spirit's testimony is not a dry and legal declaration, but the emotive cry "abbā, Father." According to Booth's argument, the emotive cry of the Spirit becomes the emotive cry of Paul's audience as they simulate the cry of the Spirit in their own minds, and experience the Spirit's attendant emotions in their mental simulations. Moreover, in the context of the narrative in Galatians 4:1–7 the emotive cry of the Spirit is particularly poignant for the audience members, who would have likely recognized that it is their own sonship which has lead to this emotive declaration by the Spirit.

In addition to the narrative of Galatians 4:1–7 inviting the audience to experience the attendant emotions of its various characters, Paul's argument in these verses draws upon several of the root metaphors of emotion identified by Kövecses. The primary root metaphor that Paul's argument utilizes to communicate emotional content is, "EMOTIONAL RELATIONSHIP IS A DISTANCE BETWEEN TWO ENTITIES,"¹⁸⁷ which propels the narrative throughout verses 1–7 as the distance between the sons and the Father gradually diminishes. In verses 1–2, although the minor son is a member of the Father's household, his access to the Father is mediated through the guardians and overseers, which implies that the son and Father do not enjoy an intimate or close emotional relationship. This implication is further confirmed by Paul's assertion that the minor son is "no different from a slave," which here underscores the distance between Father and son. Paul then describes the Father's redemptive action as action toward the enslaved sons, which is carried out by his Son. This action toward the enslaved sons (ἐξαποστέλλειν in vv. 4 and 6) combined with the Son's act to bring about redemption from the state of slavery (ἐξαγοράζειν) communicates that the Father's actions have decreased the distance between the Father and his sons, which is further evidenced by the sons' receiving their adoption to sonship (υἰοθεσία). Thus the distance between two entities (i.e., the Father and his sons) has been decreased through the mission of the Son, implying that the Son's mission brought the adopted sons into greater relational and emotional closeness with the Father. The trajectory of relational distance to relational closeness is then succinctly summarized in verse 7, where Paul shows the audience that they have moved from slaves (δοῦλος) to sons and heirs (υἱός and κληρονόμος).

The narrative's trajectory of relational distance to relational and emotional closeness is further evidenced by the root metaphors that underlie the Spirit's

187 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 92–93.

declaration of sonship in verse 6. Significantly, the Spirit cries out from within the heart of the believer, which draws upon one of Kövecses' most basic root metaphors, "IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL."¹⁸⁸ In Pauline literature, καρδία usually designates the center of the interior life, where rational, emotional, and spiritual faculties originate and dwell (e.g., Rom 2:15; 1 Cor 10:6; 2 Cor 7:2–3; Eph 3:17; Col 3:15).¹⁸⁹ In Galatians 4:6 specifically, καρδία denotes the inmost part of the believer, to which God appeals through the testimony of the Spirit. The Spirit bears witness to the innermost part of the believers, intimating their identity as sons of God.¹⁹⁰ Thus the heart, which denotes the center of the person's will and resolve (e.g., Luke 21:14; 2 Cor 9:7), the source of understanding, reflection and moral conduct (e.g., Mark 7:21; Matt 12:34; Acts 7:23), and the seat of feelings, passions, and emotions (e.g., John 14:1, 16:22; Rom 1:24; Jas 3:14),¹⁹¹ is the seat of the Spirit's declaration of sonship. This is not to say that the declaration of sonship is purely an emotional outburst, but rather to point out that the location of the declaration of sonship (the heart) emphasizes the importance of the 'abbā cry in the believers' experience of sonship.

Coupled with the importance of the Spirit's declaration coming from the heart of the believer, the relational closeness of the believer, the Spirit, and the Father is emphasized through the root metaphor "COMMUNICATION BETWEEN INTIMATES IS SHARING ONE'S INNERMOST OBJECTS."¹⁹² The message of the Spirit seated in the heart of the believer communicates a relationship of emotional closeness by drawing upon the innermost part of the believer: his or her heart. Moreover, according to Kövecses the innermost physical parts of a person (in this case the heart) are identified with the person's true or real self. Kövecses argues, "[W]hen the deepest, innermost experiences are shared, the real, true self is shared."¹⁹³ Thus by placing the Spirit's declaration within the heart of the believers, Paul is communicating that their truest selves are communicated in the Spirit's declaration of sonship.

Furthermore, Paul's use of the verb κράζειν draws upon the root metaphor "EMOTION IS A SUBSTANCE IN A CONTAINER."¹⁹⁴ Under Kövecses' understanding of emotion, Paul's description of the Spirit's cry coming from the

188 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 90.

189 Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiiothesia," 107.

190 "[the heart] primarily indicates the intimate part of man, to which God appeals through the mission of the Spirit . . . it thus acts in our hearts, becoming the intimate principle of our divine sonship" (Buscemi, "Liberta' e Huiiothesia," 107).

191 TDNT, 3:612–13.

192 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 91.

193 Ibid.

194 Ibid., 65, 136.

heart of the believers communicates that this cry is an emotional outburst that wells up and overflows from the body which, as a container, can no longer contain the emotion. Once again, this is not necessarily to say that the Spirit's cry is an ecstatic or charismatic experience, but that the language and root metaphors in the text communicate that the cry of the Spirit is an emotionally intimate response that comes from the innermost part of the believer.

Despite the fact that the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is not overtly charged or emotional language, there are many elements of the metaphor that would certainly have elicited an emotional response from Paul's audience. I argued earlier that Paul and his Galatian audience recognize their mutually shared common ground of receiving and experiencing the Spirit, and thus the *υιοθεσία* metaphor is Paul's supplied cognitive framework through which his audience perceives and interprets that experience.¹⁹⁵ It is also likely that the Galatian audience's experience of the Spirit was accompanied by a particular set of attendant emotions, which they would also likely have simulated upon hearing Paul's metaphor in Galatians 4:5. Thus in using *υιοθεσία* as a metaphor to shape the audience's perception of the experience of the Spirit, Paul also attaches the cognitive framework of *υιοθεσία* to the *attendant emotions* of that experience. Moreover, Paul's narrative in Galatians 4:1–7 invites his audience to participate in the narrative, observing the characters and experiencing their attendant emotions. The cognitive framework Paul attaches to their experience of the Spirit is a narrative designed to communicate a trajectory from emotional and relational distance to relational and emotional intimacy between the Father and his adopted sons. He identifies these attendant emotions with the Spirit's testimony of filial and familial intimacy as evidenced in the Spirit's *'abbā* cry which comes from the heart of the believers, and in his declaration that the Galatian believers have moved from slaves to sons and heirs (Gal 4:5–7). Furthermore, by grounding the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in the Galatians' experience of the Spirit he connects these attendant emotions not only to the activity of the Spirit, but also to the activity of the Father and the Son. As Dunn states, "the Spirit of the Son prays the prayer of the Son and so attests the sonship of those who thus pray."¹⁹⁶ Thus Paul invokes their shared experience of the Spirit as common ground in order to arouse the *subjective* feelings of intimacy and belonging that are latent in the narrative surrounding the *υιοθεσία* metaphor.

195 Betz, *Galatians*, 210.

196 Dunn, *Galatians*, 222.

Metaphor and Community

As I argued in chapter 3, when metaphors are used within a particular speech community they often serve as a tool for reinforcing group identity through the cultivation of intimacy and the erection of boundaries. I also noted Cohen's argument that if metaphor-makers are successful, then they will cultivate a "sameness of vision" between themselves and those who share in the metaphor.¹⁹⁷ Conversely, the metaphor will erect boundaries for those who are unable to understand the metaphor and thus are unable to participate in the speech community.¹⁹⁸ Therefore, metaphors have the potential to create and undergird the identity of a particular group or community¹⁹⁹ through the cultivation of intimacy and the establishment of common ground and group boundaries. In Galatians 4:5 the υιοθεσία metaphor creates intimate bonds between the author and audience who share in a particular understanding of the mode of entrance into sonship—namely, that sonship comes through adoption and not through lineage and law observance. The metaphor also creates community identity around the actions of the Father, Son, and Spirit that have bound the Galatians together as sons of God, and creates barriers against the agitators who have disseminated a contrary message of sonship.

Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy

In chapter three I discussed the possibility of a metaphor creating intimacy between authors and their audiences, and also between audience members. This intimacy is primarily derived from the recognition of a shared "sameness of vision" of a particular subject. In Galatians 4:5 the primary cultivation of intimacy is between the author and audience, which Paul attempts to create through a shared understanding of *how* sonship of God is achieved. Conversely, the intimacy cultivated between audience members is somewhat difficult to gauge because the shifting pronouns do not clearly establish the community whom Paul addresses,²⁰⁰ which may have diminished the ability of the Galatian audience to identify their intimate bonds with other members of the community. However, this is somewhat countered by Paul's appeal to the community's experience of the Spirit, which Paul uses to ground his υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5. Above I argued that Paul's primary achievement in using υιοθεσία as a metaphor to shape the believers' perception of their entrance into relationship with the Father was to emphasize the primacy of

197 Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22.

198 Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.

199 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 192.

200 Please provide footnote text.

the Father's initiative over and against a sonship that is through law observance or physical descent from Abraham.

If Paul is successful in persuading his audience to share in his "sameness of vision," he is also successful in cultivating an intimate bond between himself and his audience members as those who understand sonship as coming from God through *adoption* rather than through law observance.²⁰¹ Martyn argues that the agitators ("Teachers" according to Martyn) "seem also to be speaking at some length about the 'blessing of Abraham,' indicating that when God blessed the patriarch, he did so in such a way as eventually to bless those Gentiles who, by circumcision and Law observance, become 'Abraham's true descendants.'" ²⁰² If Martyn is correct, then Paul's task is to persuade the Galatians of his own version of sonship by adoption, which is in direct conflict with the message of the agitators. This is precisely what Paul aims to achieve in Galatians 3–4, where Paul spiritualizes the concept of kinship. If his Jewish opponents were concerned with gentiles being incorporated into the Jewish people by adopting circumcision as a sign of physical descent (or at least solidarity with the physical descendants) from Abraham, Paul's primary concern is to communicate that Abrahamic kinship comes through entry into the community of Christ by faith, which in turn constitutes *spiritual descent* from Abraham.²⁰³ Moreover, Paul's success in achieving a "sameness of vision" and cultivating intimacy goes beyond the audience grasping the cognitive content of his *υιοθεσία* metaphor and his version of Abrahamic descent. Rather, Paul's success is dependent on the social function of his metaphor to cultivate a shared social bond that solidifies the community in Galatia as those who have believed Paul and his message of the gospel.²⁰⁴

If Paul succeeded in cultivating an intimate bond with his audience members, then it is possible too that these audience members also recognized that they share this common bond of understanding with each other. As Gibbs argues, metaphors often rely on the "exploitation of the context of shared beliefs held by speakers and listeners"²⁰⁵ to communicate meanings that are social in addition to being propositional. Therefore, if Paul was successful in

201 See also Cohen, "Some Philosophy," 30.

202 Martyn, *Galatians*, 125.

203 Daniel Boyarin, "Was Paul an 'Anti-Semite?': A Reading of Galatians 3–4," *USQR* 47 (1993): 54.

204 In this way, the social function of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 seems to fit well with Paul's overall aim of presenting himself and his gospel as the true and trustworthy message of Christ (e.g., 1:1, 6–9, 11–12; 2:4–9; 4:12–20).

205 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 135–36.

creating a “sameness of vision,” then his υιοθεσία metaphor potentially caused the members of the Galatian community to identify that they share together an understanding of themselves as sons adopted by the Father through the mission of the Son, which then stands in sharpest contrast to their identity as “vanquished Galatians.” This communal recognition of a shared “sameness of vision” produces feelings of intimacy between group members, and also potentially produces feelings of exclusion toward those whose message differed from Paul’s. Burke argues that the υιοθεσία metaphor effected the “resocialization” of believers who may have experienced “sharp displacement which many converts would have undergone because it [conversion] brought about a radical change in relationships.”²⁰⁶ Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor filters this experience of resocialization through the framework of adoption thereby creating an intimate bond between audience members that is founded both upon the shared experience of resocialization and their shared understanding of this experience as a direct result of their transference into a new family through their adoption.

A final observation regarding the cultivation of intimacy is that Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor creates the perception of an intimate bond between the believer and all three members of the Trinity. From Paul’s perspective, the Father, Son, and Spirit not only share in a “sameness of vision” regarding the believer’s adoption, but they are the active agents in accomplishing it. In fact, the Father, Son, and Spirit initiate and carry out the mission of adoption to sonship; it is not something the believers produce, or are capable of producing,²⁰⁷ unlike the law observance being promulgated by the agitators. Moreover, the Spirit’s intimate cry of Αββα ὁ πατήρ cultivates a sense of belonging, creating a kind of “insider knowledge” surrounding the believer’s subjective experience of adoption.²⁰⁸ In the Spirit’s cry, God bears witness to the efficacy of the Son’s mission by giving the believers the language of an intimate filial relationship that echoes the Son’s own cry.²⁰⁹ The believer’s perception of this intimate bond with the Trinity functions to undergird both his or her own identity rooted firmly in the adoption to sonship extended by the Father, but also cultivates intimacy between members of the community as they understand and participate in communal life as the adopted sons of God.

206 Burke, “Adopted as Sons,” 275.

207 Hansen, *Galatians*, 120.

208 See the discussion on metaphor and community in chapter 3; see also Clark, *Using Language*, 110.

209 Fee, *Galatians*, 156.

Metaphor and the Creation of Community Identity

There is little question that one of Paul's primary aims in Galatians is to create a strong sense of community identity for his Galatian audience that centers on the work of Christ and the experience of the Spirit rather than the works of the law. For Paul it is imperative that the Galatian gentiles recognize that the foundation of their identity is God's extension of sonship apart from works of the law. In regard to the υιοθεσία metaphor in particular, Paul creates a new identity for his Galatian audience members as sons and heirs of God. Indeed, in Galatians 4 Paul is bypassing Abraham entirely to state in emphatic terms that it is the Son, under the direction of the Father, who has redeemed the slaves and brought them into sonship through adoption, to which the Spirit testifies.

Moreover, Paul's re-construal of sonship was possible because, in contradistinction to the agitators' message, Paul was not limited by ethnic or ethnocentric approaches to gentile inclusion, but rather he created a paradigm for gentile inclusion that preserved their identity *as gentiles*, yet still counted them as sons of God in Christ.²¹⁰ What is fascinating about Paul's use of υιοθεσία in Galatians 4 is that he also is able to attach Abraham's lineage to the gentile believers. Key to the reformation of community identity is the cognitive framework of υιοθεσία that communicates sonship as *bestowed* rather than inherited or attained by law observance. In Galatians 4:1–7 Paul declares that his version of sonship *via* divine adoptive is more fundamental than physical descent from Abraham,²¹¹ and he uses adoption and inheritance language to unite Jews and gentiles under the paradigm of faith rather than law-keeping or circumcision.²¹² Thus in the framework of υιοθεσία those who do not keep the law nor trace their biological lineage to Abraham are still counted among Abraham's descendants because of their *adoption* by God. Through the cognitive framework of the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 Paul makes quite clear that the Galatians, who were once outsiders and slaves, have been brought into the community as adopted sons by God; God has decreed both family and inheritance for those who were historically excluded from the promise to Abraham.

A key component of the impact of the υιοθεσία metaphor on the formation of community identity is its appeal and connection to the Galatians' experience of the Spirit. As Clark remarks, linguists regard this type of experience as the "ultimate insider information,"²¹³ and by appealing to this shared experience and overlaying it with the particular framework of υιοθεσία, Paul draws a

²¹⁰ Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 227.

²¹¹ Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 65.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 66.

²¹³ Clark, *Using Language*, 110.

boundary around the Galatian believers as those who belong to the particular subgroup of “adopted sons of God,” who share the common experience of the Spirit.²¹⁴ However, the shared experience of the Spirit is not in itself enough to solidify the Galatians’ community identity as sons of God and descendants of Abraham.²¹⁵ Rather, Paul must put forth his own interpretation of the significance of their experience—namely, that the experience of the Spirit is demonstrable proof of their adoption by the Father through the Son.

Paul’s construal of sonship as bestowed by God upon οἱ ἐκ πίστεως (the ones from faith) through the faithful action of the Son creates a powerful symbol of community identity centered on Christ’s successful mission of redemption and adoption. In this way, the υἱοθεσία metaphor goes beyond simply illuminating the boundaries between the Galatian believers and the message of the agitators but rather is strategic in forming and securing the boundaries around the community as they participate in Paul’s understanding of sonship.²¹⁶ In contradistinction to the message of Paul’s opponents, who presumably were eager to persuade the Galatian gentiles to adopt practices consistent with Jewish identity, through υἱοθεσία Paul is able to communicate a high level of belonging and community identity to those whom he urges to remain non-law-observant. Furthermore, Paul roots this new self-understanding of sonship through adoption in the objective experience of the Spirit, providing a strong proof for the Galatians that Paul’s version of sonship yields the correct understanding of their identity as believers.

Conclusion

Paul’s υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 occurs in the context of a passage rich in imagery and theological depth. Although the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 is typically described as a “soteriological” metaphor, I have argued above that it is more precise to construe the metaphor as “speaking about God’s mission to bring believers into relationship with himself in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption.” This construal of the metaphor undoubtedly speaks to similar theological concerns as the soteriological paradigm more commonly used for the framework of inquiry for the υἱοθεσία metaphor, however it also draws attention to the specific vocabulary (ἐξαποστέλλειν/send, ἐξαγοράζειν/redeem) found in the metaphor’s immediate context. The

214 Gibbs, *The Poetics of Mind*, 136.

215 See also Fowl, “Who Can Read Abraham’s Story,” 83–84.

216 Zhang, “Corporate Identity Metaphor,” 388.

immediate context of the metaphor also contributes to its potency and potential to actively and creatively form and influence the Galatian believers' perception of themselves and of the agitators' message. Although Paul draws upon some common images of a Roman household, he subtly subverts these images and includes elements that are surprising (e.g., ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς/until the time appointed by the father; ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν/so that we might receive the adoption to sonship), which draws emphatic attention to Paul's unique construal of sonship and inheritance.

Crucial to bridging the gap between the text and the metaphor's impact on the perceptions, emotions, and identity of the community members is Paul's move to ground the υἰοθεσία metaphor in the believers' experience of the Spirit. As Susann Liubinskas argues, "Given that adoption and reception of the Spirit coincide, it is life in the Spirit which identifies the people of God."²¹⁷ Paul appeals to the Galatians' common experience of the Spirit as his evidence of the success of the Son's mission to bring about their adoption to sonship. Over and against the agitators' message that sonship of God comes through Abraham and law observance, Paul urges the believers to instead view their sonship through his proposed lens of adoption. Moreover, the υἰοθεσία metaphor draws attention to the intimate bonds both between Paul and his audience, and between the audience members and the Triune God who has effected their adoption. Read through this framework, Paul's υἰοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 demonstrates the affective and performative qualities that metaphors possess, which an author may use to solidify the common ground between themselves and members of the community of their addressees.

²¹⁷ Susann Liubinskas, "Identification by Spirit Alone: Community-Identity Construction in Galatians 3:19–4:7," *AsTJ* 67.1 (2012): 35.

We Ourselves Groan Inwardly: The *υιοθεσία* Metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 8:23

Introduction

The *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 occur as a part of one of Paul's richest expositions of the Christian life, which is lived out as believers are caught "in between" the ages. Indeed, the tension between the Pauline "already" and "not yet" comprises an integral part of both expressions of a *υιοθεσία* metaphor in this chapter. Although there is sometimes a tendency to focus the interpretive task on resolving this tension,¹ the polyvalent nature of metaphor should caution us away from explanations that do not allow both metaphors to speak with their own voices.² In contrast, the methodology I have proposed for reading the *υιοθεσία* metaphors will appreciate the tension created by the polyphonous voices of the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8. I will proceed with the same two major divisions as in the previous chapter: the first section (Metaphor and Text) focusing on the literary aspects of each metaphor, and the second (Metaphor and Audience) focusing on the possible mental simulations and cognitive framework, intimacy, and identity each creates. To appreciate the unique voice of each *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 8 the first section (Metaphor and Text) of this chapter will treat each one individually, and to best address the effect of the metaphors on cognition, emotion, and

-
- 1 For example, C. K. Barrett resolves the tension by translating Rom 8:15 "the Spirit which anticipates our adoption as sons" (*Epistle to the Romans* [BNTC, London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962], 163); C. E. B. Cranfield points to the phrase *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ* and argues that *υιοθεσία* in v. 23 refers to the manifestation and public proclamation of the sonship of believers (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* [ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990], vol. 1, 419); Douglas Moo simply states that Paul's portrayal of adoption in Romans 8 "can be pictured both as past and as future" (*The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1996], 521); similarly, Thomas Schreiner states, "The problem is solved once one sees that adoption has an eschatological cast" (*Romans* [BECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998], 439).
 - 2 Because I argued in the second chapter that the meaning of a metaphor occurs at the level of an utterance, and that changes to a metaphor's frame, tenor, and vehicle result in changes to the metaphor's meaning, I will speak of the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 rather than the "*υιοθεσία* metaphor."

identity, the second (Metaphor and Audience) will synthesize the effects of both. Because Paul has used *υιοθεσία* as a description for his audience of believers in Romans 8, my focus in this chapter will primarily address how the metaphors impact their perception of and their emotional response to their relationship to God (Father, Son, and Spirit), and to others in the community of believers. As such, it is intentionally an anthropocentric approach to the text, focused on the metaphors' cognitive and affective potential for Paul's Roman audience.

Because the methodology I will use for treating these texts raises questions quite different from some more theologically driven readings of Romans 8,³ my treatment below will contain some slightly different emphases than readings driven by questions of Pneumatology or Christology. It must be said, then, at the outset that my intention is to offer this reading of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 as a complementary reading to those readings concerned with specific theological questions. However, just as in the exegesis of Galatians 4, I will refrain from treating *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 as a metaphor "for salvation,"⁴ as the possible soteriological implications of *υιοθεσία* are only some of the many entailments present in a truly robust reading.⁵ If the analysis of *υιοθεσία* is limited to an explanation of its soteriological significance, or to an account of its soteric benefits,⁶ we risk, to some degree, impoverishing the richness of Paul's imagery in Romans 8. Thus in the analysis below I will seek to appreciate a wider array of possible implications for Paul's audience, especially in light of the inherent eschatological tension he presents to them in his two uses of *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8.

3 Burke's work on Romans is an excellent example of theological readings born of careful and thorough exegesis; see especially *Adopted into God's Family*, 72–151, 177–197).

4 For the trouble of speaking of something as "a metaphor for *x*" see chapter 2.

5 For example, these metaphors in Romans 8 undoubtedly touch on personal and general eschatology, pneumatology, and ecclesiology, which will be evident from the analysis below.

6 Studies driven by the theological significance of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors tend to focus on their soteriological dimensions. This is not to say that the soteriological entailments of the metaphor are not important, but rather that the soteriological significance of the metaphor is only part of its overall meaning. For studies dealing with the soteriological significance see Trumper, "An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition"; idem, "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption," 129–45; idem, "The Theological History of Adoption I: An Account," *SBET* 20 (2002): 4–28; idem, "The Theological History of Adoption II: A Rationale," *SBET* 20 (2002): 177–202; David B. Garner, "Adoption in Christ" (Westminster Theological Seminary: Ph.D. Diss., 2002).

Paul's Audience in Rome

Although most scholars agree on several points, such as that Paul is writing to a church which he did not evangelize, that the Jews were expelled from Rome under Claudius, and that there was likely a high degree of tension between Jews and gentiles in the Roman Christian community, the precise demographics of Paul's audience in Romans remain a vigorously debated area of Pauline studies. Joseph Fitzmyer wisely states, "Part of the problem in trying to determine the Christian community to which Paul addresses his letter is that he writes to it with a certain ignorance."⁷ An older and fading view among Pauline scholars is that the abundance of Old Testament references and the prominence of Paul's concerns about the Mosaic law indicate that Paul's audience was comprised of a majority, if not entirely, of Jewish Christians.⁸ For example, Norbert Krieger states, "Beweisführung aus der Schrift wirklich nur jüdischen Lesern zumuten konnte."⁹ Similarly Fahy argues, "The Romans, to whom this letter is addressed, were outside the sphere of his commission. They were Jews, as indicated by the internal evidence."¹⁰ However, it is clear from Paul's letter to the Galatians that he feels free to include references to Jewish Scripture despite his addressees being predominantly of gentile origin, and both the internal evidence (e.g., Rom 1:5; 1:13; 11:13; 15:14–19), and the external evidence for a mixed audience for Romans seems to argue against a predominantly Jewish makeup.¹¹

On the other side of the spectrum, a reevaluation of the letter's internal evidence has led a growing number of scholars to see Romans as a letter written to an exclusively gentile audience.¹² For example, Hodge argues, "Paul never claims to be speaking to *Ioudaioi* in his letters, nor does he connect his own

7 Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB, New York: Doubleday, 1993), 33.

8 See especially F. C. Baur, "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit Zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde," in *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben: Historisch-Kritische Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, ed. Klaus Scholder (Stuttgart: Friedrich Fromman, 1963), 147–266; H. Lietzmann, "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus," *SPAW* 8 (1930): 151–56.

9 Norbert Krieger, "Zum Römerbrief," *NovT* 3.1 (1959): 148.

10 T. Fahy, "St. Paul's Romans Were Jewish Converts," *ITQ* 26 (1959): 183.

11 See especially Robert Jewett's thorough introduction (*Romans* [Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press], 2007, 46–75).

12 E.g., William S. Campbell, "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 171–95; Neil Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism* (JSNTSup 45, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*; Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 201–207; Mark Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress

teaching activity with *Ioudaioi*. . . . Therefore, I do not seek for evidence about historical communities, but for the ways Paul portrays his audience, how he creates their identity.¹³ In addition, Johannes Munck points to external historical evidence to support his claim. Munck states, "While Paul has been the apostle to the Gentiles, Peter and the other Jewish apostles have gone on to preach to the Jews in the east. There is therefore no Jewish Christian mission in the Pauline mission fields."¹⁴ Stanley Stowers eschews the possibility of recovering the "real audience" of Romans, but emphatically states, "I can know with certainty that the audience in the text is gentiles at Rome who know something about Jewish scripture and Jesus Christ."¹⁵ However, although differentiating between the implied audience and the real audience of the letter may illuminate some of the text's rhetorical strategies, it might also be argued that the trouble with attempting to construct the historical audience of the letter "out of the text," without also considering the historical evidence for the ethnic makeup of the Roman church, makes it quite possible for an interpreter to construct an audience that fits his or her paradigm of exegesis best. There is little doubt that Romans was addressed to a primarily gentile audience, but it is difficult to maintain that the makeup of the letter's audience was *exclusively* gentile. Such claims seem more driven by an ideological framework regarding the status of the Jewish community than grounded in a sound method of historiography.¹⁶

With the majority of scholars,¹⁷ I will proceed with the premise that Paul's audience was comprised primarily of gentiles, though likely contained a number of Jews as well. Regarding the internal evidence, Paul, in his argument in Romans, seems particularly interested in the relations between Jewish Christians and gentile Christians (e.g., 1:16; 3:29–30; 4:11–12; 11:13–24) and questions of identity for both Jewish and gentile members of the Christian community in Rome (e.g., 2:25–29; 9:6–13; 11:5–7). Furthermore, it is perhaps unlikely that Paul would feel the need to offer the aside "I am speaking to you, gentiles," (Ἰμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν) in Romans 11:13 if, in fact, he had been speaking to

Press, 1996), 75–84; Idem., "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *CBQ* 61.2 (1999): 283–304; Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*.

13 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 9–11.

14 Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 208.

15 Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, 22.

16 See also John Barclay's helpful critique of Stowers (review of *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*, by Stanley Stowers, *JTS* 46.2 [1995]: 646–51).

17 E.g., Barrett, *Romans*, 22; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 18; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC, Dallas: Word Books, 1988), vol. 1, xlv; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 32–33; Jewett, *Romans*, 70–72; Moo, *Romans*, 12–13; Schreiner, *Romans*, 13.

an entirely gentile audience all along. In addition, it is highly likely, though not entirely certain, that Paul's discussion of the "strong" and the "weak" in Romans 14 touches upon tensions that have arisen between Jews and gentiles over dietary regulations.¹⁸

Regarding the external evidence, it is most likely that the church in Rome was evangelized by Jewish missionaries and had a strong Jewish presence and continued ties to Jerusalem,¹⁹ though the Jewish character of the churches was likely influenced by the expulsion of the Jews under Claudius.²⁰ For example, Prisca and Aquila are introduced in Acts 18 as Jewish believers who were forced to leave Italy under Claudius, suggesting that there was at least some presence of Jewish Christianity in Rome prior to Paul's letter arriving. James Dunn further remarks, "[K]nowledge of the OT within the ancient world was confined almost wholly to Jewish and Jewish-derived communities."²¹ For Paul to assume that his audience had a detailed knowledge of the Old Testament, he would have also likely had to assume that they maintained some connection to the Jewish community in Rome, most likely through continued ties to the synagogue.²² In light, then, of both internal and corroborating external evidence, it is most likely that the audience to whom Paul addresses his letter is comprised of a majority of gentiles and a minority of Jews.

Romans 8:15–23: Preliminary Exegetical Issues

Although the focus of this chapter will be on an interpretation of the two *υἱοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8:15–23, there are several initial exegetical decisions that must be made in order to situate the analysis of the metaphor within

18 This is not to say that the "strong" and the "weak" correspond precisely to the gentile and Jewish believers, but rather to point out that the concerns Paul addresses seem to be over dietary laws. As Jewett remarks, "It is likely that the majority of the strong were gentile believers, with Jewish liberals such as Paul and his close allies included in this group. It is also likely that the weak included Jewish adherents to the law, but this group probably included some gentiles who had been close to synagogues before becoming believers" (*Romans*, 71).

19 See R. E. Brown and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity* (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 89–127; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2016), 8–9.

20 Dunn notes, "When the expulsion took place is a matter of some dispute. . . . The best solution is probably to see two actions by Claudius in 41 and 49: the first an early palliative ruling, short-lived and limited in effect; the second more deliberate and drastic after his patience had worn out" (*Romans*, vol. 1, xlix).

21 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, l.

22 Ibid.

the larger context of Romans 8. Albeit numerous interpretational and exegetical conundrums exist in Romans 8, those most pertinent to the analysis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors are the connotations of *σάρξ* (flesh) and *πνεῦμα* (Spirit), the antecedent of *ἐν ᾧ* in verse 15, the translation of *αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν* (the Spirit testifies to/with our spirit), Paul's family map in Romans 8, and the textual variant in Romans 8:23. The origin and meaning of *Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ* (*ʾabbā*, Father) also figures significantly in the meaning of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8, however it is likely that Paul uses the *ʾabbā* cry here in the same way he invokes it in Galatians 4:6.²³ The sense of the genitive *υιοθεσίας* in verse 15 is also relevant to the interpretation of the metaphor, but the case use of the genitive is closely related to the tenor of the metaphor and so will be treated in detail below. In addition to these particular exegetical decisions, it is also necessary to establish the overall focus and tone of Romans 8 in order to analyze the impact that the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors have on the text and the readers.

In order to situate the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors within Romans 8, it is helpful here to establish how the chapter fits into the overall structure of the letter. Some commentaries treat Romans 8 as Paul's exposition of the believers' experience of life in the Spirit.²⁴ However, it is also possible to read Romans 8 on a more cosmic scale, focusing instead on the totality of God's redemptive actions.²⁵ Characteristic of this view, Vincent Branick states, "Paul's task is rather to understand what God is doing for his creation, how God has overcome and is overcoming the powers of death in the universe."²⁶ Paul's description of the activity of the Father, Son, and Spirit in Romans 8, together with the presence of cosmic language and imagery, fits well within this paradigm of interpretation. Given also that the two instances of *υιοθεσία* metaphors occur against the backdrop of this cosmic and apocalyptic imagery, a "cosmically oriented" reading seems all the more warranted. Therefore, while the exegesis below will appreciate the role of the Spirit in the Christian life, the starting point of interpretation will intentionally be on the cosmic scale of God's redemptive action, including especially the eschatological framework of the metaphors.

The meaning of *σάρξ* (flesh) in the Pauline corpus is a thorny interpretive issue, and many translations are driven by theological concerns in addition to

23 See chapter 5 for a discussion on the origin and meaning of the *ʾabbā* cry.

24 E.g., Moo, *Romans*, 467–537; Grant Osborne, *Romans* (IVP New Testament Commentary Downers Grove: IVP, 2004), 192–224; Schreiner, *Romans*, 395–447.

25 See esp. Jewett, *Romans*, 474–530.

26 Vincent P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul?," *CBQ* 47.4 (1985): 666.

lexical evidence.²⁷ Moreover, the dichotomy of σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) in Romans 8:4–9 forms the heart of Paul's argument in these verses, and the implications of a life lived according to σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) are the central emphasis of verses 12–17. Although there are a few scholars who see σάρξ (flesh) as possessing at least some degree of negative connotation in every Pauline occurrence,²⁸ most interpreters acknowledge that Paul uses σάρξ (flesh) in positive, neutral, and negative contexts.²⁹ However, regardless of whether positive connotations for σάρξ (flesh) are present elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, its use in Romans 8 where it is consistently juxtaposed with πνεῦμα (Spirit) surely suggests a negative connotation for σάρξ (flesh) in this passage. Indeed Schlier remarks, “[Das Fleisch] ist nicht nur Gott feindlich, sondern aktive Feindschaft gegen Gott.”³⁰ The negative connotation of σάρξ (flesh) in Romans 8 is fairly uncontroversial, but it is less clear if σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) are to be understood in terms of two contrasting ontologies,³¹ two contrasting modes of behavior,³² or possibly even epochs or realms of influence.³³ As I will now argue, in light of the cosmic and eschatological tone of Romans 8 as a whole, the last option seems to fit the contextual evidence best.

Although some argue that σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) represent two distinct ontological categories of people (believers and unbelievers), it is unlikely that Paul imagines two distinct classes of people who possess two distinct and distinguishable ontological essences that lock them into opposite destinies.³⁴ Moreover, the νόθεσία metaphor in 8:15, which is closely linked to Paul's under-

27 See e.g., I Howard Marshall's summary of the theological and lexical issues in his article “Living in the ‘Flesh,’” *BSac* 159 (2002): 387–403.

28 See e.g., Elizabeth Gordon Edwards, “Exploring the Implications of Paul's Use of *Sarx* (Flesh),” in *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert Brawley (Louisville: WJK, 1996), 69–75; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 13.

29 See e.g., Marshall, “Living in the ‘Flesh,’” 387–403; J. P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), xiv–xv; Wilber T. Dayton, “The New Testament Conception of Flesh,” *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 2.1 (1967): 7–17.

30 Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT, Freiburg: Herder, 1977), 245.

31 E.g., Schreiner, *Romans*, 410–17; Moo, *Romans*, 486–87; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 488; Jewett, *Romans*, 486.

32 See esp. Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 424–30; Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (SP, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996), 238–41.

33 This view would be similar to Martyn's understanding of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in Galatians (Martyn, *Galatians*, 529–40).

34 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 425.

standing of πνεῦμα (Spirit), does not lend itself well to the ontological view, since adoption as a model connotes a change in position or relationship rather than a change in essence. However, reading σὰρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) as moral categories minimizes the cosmic and eschatological language of Romans 8, and minimizes the significance of υἰοθεσία as a term of permanent transfer between οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες (those who exist according to the flesh) and οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα [ὄντες] (those who exist according to the Spirit). The last view, which takes σὰρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) as two contrasting epochs and realms of influence, understands them to refer to two “occupying powers” which are engaged in an apocalyptic and eschatological battle.³⁵ According to this view, those who exist κατὰ σάρκα and also have the mindset of the flesh (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς) exist within the realm of the old age. In contrast, those who exist κατὰ πνεῦμα and have the mindset of the Spirit (τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος) have been, in some sense, transferred into the new eschatological age by virtue of their adoption and reception of the Spirit. However, since these two ages, in some sense, exist simultaneously, there is a high degree of tension between the σὰρξ (flesh) and the πνεῦμα (Spirit), which is particularly evident in Paul’s language in Romans 8:17–23 where all of creation groans awaiting the final outcome of the battle.

There are several significant grammatical issues to consider before moving into the analysis of the υἰοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15–23. The first is what the phrase ἐν ᾧ κρᾶζομεν (in whom/that we cry) refers to, the personal πνεῦμα (Spirit), or the impersonal “in that,” which would refer to the entire experience of receiving the Spirit of adoption. Although some interpreters have pointed to the plural form of κρᾶζομεν as an indication that Paul has envisaged this “crying out” as part of a baptismal ritual or a corporate worship setting,³⁶ the close proximity of πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας (Spirit of adoption) makes it a more likely antecedent for the relative pronoun.³⁷ Under this reading, the Spirit is the one who enables the believer to cry Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (‘abbā, Father) and as Cranfield remarks, “‘Abba’ is represented as a result of the gift of the Spirit.”³⁸

Another preliminary grammatical issue that relates to the role of the Spirit in the reception of υἰοθεσία is the classification of the dative and the Spirit’s function in the phrase αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν (the Spirit

35 See Martyn, *Galatians*, 530–31.

36 E.g., Jewett, *Romans*, 498–99; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 272; see also the translation “When we cry, ‘Abba, Father,’” in the NRSV.

37 E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452–531; Barrett, *Romans*, 163–64.

38 Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 398–99.

testifies to/with our spirit). Cranfield suggests that *συμμαρτυρεῖν* (to testify) and the dative τῷ πνεύματι should be understood as the Spirit testifying *to our spirit* rather than *with our spirit*. Cranfield argues, “What standing has our spirit in *this* matter? Of itself it surely has no right at all to testify to our being sons of God.”³⁹ However, Cranfield’s translation stretches the normal range of the σύν- prefix, which elsewhere in Romans 8 Paul clearly intends to mean “together with” (e.g., *συγκληρονόμοι* / “co-heirs with,” *συμπάσχομεν* / “suffer together with,” and *συνδοξασθῶμεν* / “be glorified together with,” in v. 17). Rather, it is appropriate to understand *συμμαρτυρεῖ* in verse 15 as “testifies together with,” where Paul involves the believers’ spirit in the activity of testifying that they are “children of God.”

Another preliminary point of contention is Paul’s “family map” in Romans 8, where the believers are designated *ἀδελφοί* (brothers and sisters) (v. 12), *υἱοί* (sons) (vv. 14, 19), *τέκνα* (children) (vv. 16, 17, 21), *κληρονόμοι* (heirs) and *συγκληρονόμοι* (co-heirs) (v. 17), and later Christ is designated as *πρωτότοκος* (firstborn) “among many brothers and sisters” (*ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς*) in verse 29.⁴⁰ Aasgaard has expressed uncertainty that Christ’s designation as “firstborn among many brothers and sisters” leads to the conclusion that Christians are siblings among themselves.⁴¹ Rather he argues that Christians are co-siblings with Christ, although Christ is placed in “an elevated position,”⁴² but that this does not emphasize the horizontal connections among Christians, and, in Aasgaard’s view, “Rom. 8.29 cannot serve as a basis for a christological justification for Christian siblingship in general in Paul.”⁴³ While Aasgaard may be correct in his assertion that the “family map” of Romans 8 is incomplete insofar as it does not draw an explicit connection between Christians as siblings of Christ and Christians as siblings with one another, his concerns regarding the *familia Dei* seem a bit too cautious. If metaphors by nature suggest models, and if Paul’s metaphorical language in Romans 8 draws upon the model of a

39 Ibid., 403.

40 There is also a debate as to whether *πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* is a pre-Pauline or Pauline addition to the “golden chain” in verse 29; see Aasgaard, “*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*,” 140–41; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 245–47. However, the manuscript tradition suggests a stable text and there is nothing much to be gained in debating whether the addition was pre-Pauline or Pauline. Moreover, Aasgaard’s insistence that the addition signifies that “something is at stake,” and that “v. 29bc serves to link it [the golden chain] with a christological aspect, and thus emphasize the role of Jesus” would also be true if the addition were pre-Pauline (“*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*,” 140–41).

41 Aasgaard, “*My Beloved Brothers and Sisters*,” 145–49.

42 Ibid., 146.

43 Ibid., 148.

household, it is not unwarranted to conclude that Paul envisions these relationships (sibling, son, co-heir, brother) existing within the same household. Rather, the onus is on Aasgaard to demonstrate how kinship language in such close proximity could be mapped onto two *distinct* households: one where Christian believers are brothers and sisters (v. 12), and a separate kinship structure where Christian believers are siblings of Christ but not of one another (vv. 17, 29). Recent research in cognitive linguistics has shown that related metaphors within a discourse are processed through a web of interconnected “integration networks” that blend and integrate metaphors into a dynamic conceptual system.⁴⁴ In light of this research, it is nearly unthinkable that two metaphors drawn from the same conceptual domain would remain disjointed in the mind of the hearer. Moreover, metaphors which draw upon the same model do not need to be harmonized fully within the text, as it is in the nature of metaphors to suggest their implications to their audience whereby the audience is able to harmonize the metaphors.⁴⁵ Thus it is highly likely that Paul’s use of kinship terms in Romans 8 has strong vertical *and* horizontal implications.

The final preliminary issue that must be considered prior to the analysis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors is the textual variant in Romans 8:23 which omits the single word *υιοθεσίαν*.⁴⁶ The manuscript evidence for the inclusion of *υιοθεσίαν* in verse 23 is much stronger,⁴⁷ and Fitzmyer admits “it is difficult to explain how it got into the text of most of the other Greek mss.”⁴⁸ Metzger comments that *υιοθεσίαν* was likely omitted because “copyists doubtless found [it] to be both clumsy in the context and dispensable, as well as seeming to contradict v 15.”⁴⁹ The weight of the manuscript evidence and the *lectio difficilior* both weigh strongly for the inclusion of *υιοθεσίαν* in verse 23, which emphasizes the tension between the now and the not-yet in the two iterations of *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8.

44 Gilles Fauconnier, and Mark Turner, “Rethinking Metaphor,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed., Raymond W. Gibbs Jr. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2008), 63–65.

45 Ibid., 54–60.

46 P⁴⁶vid D F G 614.

47 P⁴⁶ a A C 81, 1506, 1739, 1881.

48 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 510. N.b., Fitzmyer concludes that “it is preferably omitted” because of Paul’s statement that believers have already been adopted in 8:15.

49 Roger L. Omanson, *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger’s Textual Commentary for the Needs of Translators* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006), 304.

Metaphor and Text

The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 8:15 and 8:23

Recall that rather than treating υιοθεσία as a “metaphorical word,” this study will operate under the premise that metaphorical meaning occurs at the level of a complete utterance.⁵⁰ In Romans 8:15 Paul’s metaphorical utterance occurs as part of a rich descriptive sequence of related metaphors utilizing imagery of slavery, adoption, and inheritance. Thus it is necessary not only to consider Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphors individually, but also to consider how they relate to the other metaphors in the immediate context. In the context of Romans 8, those who live according to the Spirit (8:5), and who are led by the Spirit (8:14), are those who receive the adoption to sonship (8:15). Likewise, those who have the mindset of the Spirit (8:5–6) no longer retain their former mindset of fear and slavery, but rather they now have minds and hearts that participate with Christ’s cry, “*abbā*, Father.” Paul continues further, and indicates that the believers’ sonship also implies that they are co-heirs together with Christ, and are destined for glory if they share in his suffering (8:17).⁵¹ Since these themes are intertwined, the other concepts and metaphors in this passage inform Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor, and vice versa.

Within 8:15 there are two distinct but related metaphors that have the same referent:⁵² the Holy Spirit. The first metaphor in 8:15 is posed in contrast to the υιοθεσία metaphor: οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον (you did not receive a spirit of slavery to fall back again into fear). There are several interpretive options for the two “spirits” in verse 15,⁵³ but it is preferable to see the two metaphors Paul uses as a rhetorical negation and an affirmation

50 For an explanation of metaphorical meaning see chapter 2.

51 See also Douglas Campbell, “The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: wjk, 2002), 106.

52 Soskice states, “[W]e conclude that the metaphorical vehicle is not used to pick out a second subject, or another referent, but to describe the referent picked out by the whole of the utterance, or more accurately, by the speaker in making the utterance” (*Metaphor and Religious Language*, 53).

53 One option is to argue that these references describe the human spirit (e.g., William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. [ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902], 202–203). Dunn also notes that the two references could “reflect the current way of expressing opposition between God and evil in terms of good and evil spirits” (e.g., 1QS 3.18ff.; *T. Reub.* 5.3; *T. Sim.* 2.7; 3.1; 4.7; *T. Levi* 2.3; 9.9; 18.7, 11; *T. Jud.* 13.3; 14.2.8; 20.1) (*Romans*, vol. 1, 451). Another alternative is to see these spirits as a contrast between the two ages (E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452).

predicated of the Holy Spirit.⁵⁴ The vehicle in the first metaphor is δουλεία (slavery), which acts as a foil for what Paul affirms about the Spirit in the υιοθεσία metaphor that follows. There are two possible ways of construing the metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία in Romans 8:15. The first is to restrict it to the clause in which υιοθεσία occurs, rendering the utterance ἄλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας (but you received a Spirit of υιοθεσίας). This construal treats the last prepositional phrase of verse 15 as a (possibly non-metaphorical) modifier of τὸ πνεῦμα (the Spirit). Several analyses of verse 15 favor this option, such as the NRSV translation which inserts the temporal "when" into the verse translating verse 15 "when we cry, 'Abba! Father!'"⁵⁵ The more preferable option is to treat ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ (in whom we cry 'abbā, Father) as an extension of the υιοθεσία metaphor.⁵⁶ In this view, the 'abbā prayer reflects the unrehearsed response emitted by believers when they receive their adoption to sonship, and it expresses their awareness of their inclusion in the *familia Dei* and the enactment of their filial relationship with God.⁵⁷ Since the image of υιοθεσία is naturally associated with other kinship terms, especially the images of Ἀββὰ ('abbā), and πατήρ (Father), and since the act of crying out to the Father is so closely associated with the believer's reception of the Spirit, it is best to understand the prepositional phrase as part of the υιοθεσία metaphorical utterance in this context. Thus the metaphorical utterance in Romans 8:15 is: ἄλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ (and you have received the Spirit of adoption, in whom we cry 'abbā, Father).

Similar to the construction of verse 15, the metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία in Romans 8:23 occurs in a short string of related metaphors, though they use slightly different vehicles from the sequence in verse 15 (ἀπαρχή/firstfruits, υιοθεσία, and ἀπολύτρωσις/redemption). Here then, the complete metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία occurs in the middle of the verse, in the clause ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι (we ourselves also groan inwardly, eagerly awaiting our υιοθεσίαν). The υιοθεσία metaphor is further modified by the opening clause of the verse, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ

54 This position is held by Cranfield (*Romans*, vol. 1, 396); Fitzmyer (*Romans*, 499–500); Moo (*Romans*, 500–501), and Schreiner (*Romans*, 424–25).

55 Interpreters who see this as either a baptismal rite or a worship situation might also distinguish the action of "receiving the Spirit of adoption" from the act of crying out "Abba! Father!" (e.g., Jewett, *Romans*, 498). See also Cranfield's helpful critique of the RSV translation that connects ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ to verse 16 (*Romans*, vol. 1, 398).

56 This fits with the translation and interpretation of the majority of scholars (e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 398–99; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 452–53; Moo, *Romans*, 502–503; Osborne, *Romans*, 206–207; Schreiner, *Romans*, 425–26).

57 See also Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 95.

τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες (but also we who have the firstfruits of the Spirit) which qualifies the tenor of the υἰοθεσία metaphor, clarifying that those longing for adoption are those who have the “firstfruits of the Spirit.” This qualification limits the application of the υἰοθεσία metaphor to a specific type of person (those who have the Spirit), and also adds a temporal dimension to the metaphor by suggesting that the “firstfruits” were received in anticipation of a future event. Moreover, having received the firstfruits of the harvest, Paul also implies that the believers who have the Spirit have been dedicated to God.⁵⁸ The reception of the Spirit heightens the believers’ sense of displacement, and they are keenly aware of the tension between belonging to God and their ongoing struggle with the flesh.⁵⁹ Thus there is a strong connection between the metaphor of the Spirit as the firstfruits and the υἰοθεσία metaphor, which suggests that the metaphorical utterance containing υἰοθεσία in verse 23 is directed at a particular experience (receiving the Spirit) with both a present and a future expectation (υἰοθεσία).

The final phrase, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν (the redemption of our body), is sometimes taken as a straightforward, exegetical clarification of υἰοθεσία—namely, the final expression of adoption is evidenced by the redemption of the body.⁶⁰ However, it is problematic to assert that one metaphor “explains” another metaphor.⁶¹ Each metaphor contributes its own vehicle and conjures its own set of entailments. Furthermore, interpreters often move from the Pauline metaphor of “redemption” to the act of resurrection as if the two were entirely synonymous. While there is no doubt that the “redemption of our body” for Paul entails resurrection, redemption implies a release from bondage and slavery that is missing in the term “resurrection.” Therefore, while it is certainly true that the twin metaphors of υἰοθεσία and redemption complement each other, it is unsatisfactory to reduce “υἰοθεσία” to “redemption,” or vice versa. Each metaphor in this verse contributes something unique to the overall picture of God’s saving action in the context of the whole of creation, and we must therefore carefully consider how these images relate to, or rather *explain*, each other. Thus in the analysis below we will treat ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι (we ourselves also groan

58 James Dunn, “Spirit Speech: Reflections on Romans 8:12–27,” in *Romans & the People of God*, eds. Sven K. Soderlund, and N. T. Wright (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 86.

59 Ibid., 87.

60 E.g., Burke remarks, “The last element in adoption is the ‘redemption of our body’ (v. 23) where the two phrases υἰοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι and τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν are related exegetically and understood as one event” (“Adopted as Sons,” 286).

61 See chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation.

inwardly, eagerly awaiting our *υἰοθεσίαν*) and *τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν* (the redemption of our body) as two separate metaphors.

Models, Tenors, and Vehicles

Model and Vehicle

The question of which model underlies the *υἰοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 continues to be a topic of some debate, though it is most often discussed in terms of the “background” of the metaphor.⁶² Recall that a model is a “consistent imaginative construct,” or a “system of associated commonplaces,” that lies beneath the surface of every metaphor.⁶³ In my earlier discussion on metaphor and model I identified three primary options put forth for the background of these metaphors: Greek adoption, Roman adoption, and Jewish sonship. However, unlike studies that attempt to isolate the background, I argued that it is likely that members of Paul’s audience associated various elements from each of these backgrounds depending primarily on their ethnicity, religious background, and social location. Thus I will analyze the metaphors in Romans 8 with a framework that allows for elements of Greco-Roman adoption and Jewish sonship within the model.

I argued in chapter 2 that metaphors create their meaning by means of a *vehicle*. In Soskice’s definition, a metaphor’s vehicle is the “terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”⁶⁴ Moreover, a vehicle, which is a term in the text of the metaphor, has the potential to evoke one or more submerged models. The false dichotomy of mutually exclusive backgrounds in Romans 8 results from collapsing the vehicle (*υἰοθεσία*) and models of the metaphors into a single “background” rather than recognizing that metaphorical vehicles may draw on more than one model simultaneously. The primary vehicle of both 8:15 and 8:23 is unquestionably *υἰοθεσία*, with 8:15 also adding the vehicle *Αββᾶ ὁ πατήρ* (*‘abbā, Father*). If we think of the metaphor’s vehicle as the conduit, conductor, or transporter of the model(s), the limitations of “background” in Romans 8 disappear. Rather, the vehicle, *υἰοθεσία*, leads Paul’s audience members to associate the model or models evoked by the vehicle. Moreover, if the model or models evoked occur in the minds of Paul’s audience, then attempting to restrict the possible model to a single background implies that *precisely*

62 See chapters 2 and 4 for discussions of model.

63 See chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 41; Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 38.

64 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15.

*the same model is conjured by each member of the audience.*⁶⁵ Given factors such as the diversity in socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and gender likely present in Paul's audience, it is difficult to rule out one model entirely.⁶⁶

Proceeding with the understanding that no one model can be entirely ruled out, other factors in the context of Romans 8 are more suggestive of Roman adoption than Jewish sonship, but the precise relationship between these two models in Romans 8 calls for more careful consideration. First, as I have already noted, Scott's exhaustive research demonstrates that υιοθεσία, the vehicle of both 8:15 and 8:23, is a term that always denotes "adoption," and is never used as a general expression of sonship.⁶⁷ This in itself does not necessarily rule out the possibility of a Jewish sonship model, but it does mean that any model based on the Jewish sonship tradition is still filtered through the Greek word υιοθεσία, which means "adoption."⁶⁸ Textual relationships do not occur solely between texts; rather, they also encompass the cultures in which texts are embedded. Texts (and in our case models) are continuously reappropriated and contextualized for new cultural settings, which further suggests that it is impossible to separate the models neatly into "Jewish sonship" and "Roman adoption."

However, it is also true that the likelihood of an audience member associating a model of Jewish sonship, which rests on the knowledge of Israelite history and Scripture, depends entirely on his or her familiarity with the history of the designation *sons of God* for ethnic Israel.⁶⁹ This familiarity among the gentiles in Paul's audience likely existed along a continuum, with some being quite familiar with Israel's Scriptures, and others less so. While Christianity undoubtedly grew out of the Jewish community in Rome,⁷⁰ following the edict

65 For another helpful critique on the difficulty of separating out particular "backgrounds" of υιοθεσία see Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42–76.

66 By positing that Paul's audience is comprised of an at least somewhat diverse group of people, I am not here intending to make a definitive statement regarding the precise makeup of the congregations in Rome. However, Jewett's argument that Paul's letter addresses at least "eight to ten separate congregations" in Rome, and that these congregations were comprised both of tenement churches and patron churches is persuasive (see *Romans*, 59–70; see also Peter Lampe, *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, trans. Michael Steinhauser, ed. Marshall D. Johnson [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003] 153–83).

67 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 45–55.

68 Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42.

69 This issue will be taken up in greater detail in the following chapter on Romans 9:4 where the model of Jewish sonship is drawn fully into view by the text.

70 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 1.

of Claudius the Christian house churches likely would have attracted other gentiles who had no previous connection with Judaism.⁷¹ Thus in Romans 8, the Israelite sonship model is accessible to an audience member insofar as he or she was familiar with Israel's Scripture and traditions. Furthermore, for those audience members who were familiar with Israelite sonship, it is difficult to argue that the models would remain neatly separated in the cognitive space of their minds. It is far more likely that the models were blended with perhaps one model dominating the framework while the others provided subtle shading in the background.

Furthermore, because Paul uses a series of other terms that are connected to Roman adoption practices (πατήρ/Father, κληρονόμοι/heirs), I would argue that the dominant model in Romans 8:15 is drawn from Roman adoption. For example, Romans 8:15–17 connects the act of adoption (υιοθεσία), with the enduring status of being both children and heirs of God (τέκνα θεοῦ, κληρονόμοι θεοῦ). Since the primary purpose of adoption in Roman culture was to secure an heir,⁷² it seems likely that the presence of υιοθεσία combined with kinship terms (v. 14 υἱοὶ θεοῦ/sons of God, v. 15 Ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ/abbā, Father, v. 16 τέκνα θεοῦ/children of God) *and also with terms of inheritance* (κληρονόμοι/heirs and συγκαληρονόμοι/co-heirs) would have conjured the model of Roman adoption for most, if not all, of Paul's audience members. Moreover, given the prominence of adoption in the Roman Imperial family, it is difficult to imagine that Paul's audience would not have associated υιοθεσία with the images of Roman adoption which loomed so largely in the culture surrounding their church.⁷³

The model associated with Romans 8:23 is perhaps less straightforward, as Paul seems to abruptly insert the υιοθεσία metaphor into a context dominated by apocalyptic imagery of birth pangs, travail, and groaning. Furthermore, the abrupt shift in metaphors potentially obscures the relationship between the created order and the believers in verses 22–23, which leads some scholars to focus on the believers' distinctness from the groaning of the rest of creation. Burke comments, "Paul leaves his discussion of natural birth deliberately suspended in mid air as his thoughts shift from the imagery of biological birth of the inanimate order to a different and more important legal metaphor of adopted sons and daughters."⁷⁴ While Burke is right to identify two different metaphors in verse 22 (συνωδίνειν/groaning in labor) and 23 (υιοθεσία), the overlap

71 Ibid., liii.

72 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 60.

73 Lewis, *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption,"* 43–96; Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," 42; Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 31–33.

74 Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.

between other descriptions of both creation and believers (ἀπεκδέχεσθαι/eagerly waiting in vv. 19, 23; συστενάζειν/groan together, στενάζειν/groan in vv. 22, 23) demonstrates the believers' solidarity with creation. Despite the shift in metaphors, the believers display the same signs of eager expectation in their own groans and cries for υἰοθεσία, which highlights their creaturely dependence upon God alongside the longings of the rest of creation. Verse 23 therefore draws attention to the intertwined destinies of all that God has created, who together long for the renewal of creation and the υἰοθεσία of the sons of God.⁷⁵

How much of the Roman legal model and the Jewish sonship model underlie the vehicle υἰοθεσία in the context of verse 23? Paul's readers who were familiar with the texts in the Jewish sonship model would likely have continued to associate that model of sonship through verse 23. Since Paul has already used terms suggestive of Roman adoption in 8:15, it is likely that at least some parts of the Roman adoption are carried over in verse 23. However, the language of metaphorical birth pangs in verse 22 presents a somewhat competing image for υἰοθεσία in verse 23. The combination of a competing metaphor and the lack of terms directly related to Roman adoption (e.g., Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ/ābbā, Father κληρονόμοι/heirs) dull the edges of the Roman model that is clearer in verse 15. To use Black's terminology, perhaps in verse 23 the Roman adoption model is more "submerged" than in 8:15, but it is also unlikely that the two metaphors evoke entirely different models since they occur in such close proximity to one another.

Tenor

Both the history of interpretation and contextual considerations make identifying the tenor of each υἰοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8 a slightly more complicated exegetical query than the identification of its vehicle and model(s). Since the tenors of the metaphors are not identical, I will address them here in turn. Recall that the tenor is the subject of the metaphor, or in Dawes's definition, the "subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed."⁷⁶ Remember also that the tenor of a metaphor need not be a term explicitly named in the text,⁷⁷ which is likely the case in Romans 8:15. Taking into consideration the history of interpretation of adoption in 8:15 and also contextual constraints, I propose that three candidates for the metaphor's tenor emerge: (1) the salvation of the

75 Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "Neither Height nor Depth: Discerning the Cosmology of Romans," *SJT* 64.3 (2011): 276–77.

76 Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27.

77 Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 46–47.

believer, (2) the reception of the Spirit, and (3) the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community. This is not to say that these three tenors can be neatly separated, but rather my intention in the analysis below is to elucidate which of these tenors is dominant in Romans 8:15, with the possibility of the other options being present as subsidiary entailments of the metaphor.

The overwhelming majority of theological interpretations of Romans 8:15 either overtly state or tacitly assume that *υιοθεσία* here is a metaphor "for salvation."⁷⁸ Substituting the terms of 8:15 in Soskice's definition, this renders the metaphor "whereby we speak about salvation in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Because of the prevalence of discourse on Paul's metaphors "for salvation," this construction of the metaphor likely seems perfectly reasonable and adequate.⁷⁹ However, equating adoption with the salvation of the believer (or believers) in Romans 8:15 in fact does not provide a comprehensive enough tenor for the metaphor. As stated previously, one difficulty in using "salvation" as the tenor of the metaphor is that it itself is a metaphor.⁸⁰ This is identifiable when we look at passages where *σωτηρία* (salvation) occurs in a conventional (i.e., non-metaphorical) context (e.g., Acts 7:25; Heb 11:7), and also where it occurs as the vehicle of a metaphor (1 Chr 16:35; 2 Cor 6:2). In each of these contexts salvation implies rescue or deliverance, which is a different (though complementary) framework for thinking about God's action toward people.⁸¹ Thus, each metaphor, "adoption" and "salvation," brings its own

78 E.g., Burke states, "*huiiothesia* is another soteriological metaphorical expression for the apostle Paul" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 38); See also James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 469; Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 891–95; Wayne Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 738; John Murray, *Collected Writings of John Murray*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977), 234; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 197–204; Thomas Schreiner, *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ* (Downers Grove: IVP, 2001), 240; Georg Strecker, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (New York: De Gruyter, 2000), 176.

79 E.g., Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Andreas B. du Toit, "Forensic metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance," in *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt (NovTSup 121, Leiden: Brill, 2005), 213–46; D. François Tolmie, "Salvation as Redemption: The Use of 'Redemption' Metaphors in Pauline Literature," in *Idem.*, 247–269.

80 See chapters 2 and 5.

81 Here too it is helpful to remember that metaphors exist on a continuum from very "live" to "dead" or nearly dead. Due to its abundance in the biblical text, "salvation" is much further

structure and set of entailments to the text, and therefore using one to explain the other complicates rather than elucidates the metaphor's true subject.

Another difficulty in using "salvation" as the tenor for the υιοθεσία metaphor in 8:15 is that in this context it too narrowly focuses the meaning of "adoption" on the soteric benefits for the believers.⁸² This narrow construction leaves little room for reflection on other aspects of the text, such as the presence of *both vertical and horizontal* kinship language (e.g., υιοθεσία, υιοί/sons, Αββα ὁ πατήρ/ābbā, Father, κληρονόμοι/heirs, ἀδελφοί/siblings, συγκληρονόμοι/co-heirs).⁸³ In exegesis that treats adoption as a metaphor for salvation, the vertical relationships (i.e., the relationship with the Father, Christ, and the Spirit) are usually noted.⁸⁴ However, the presence of plural endings throughout, and Paul's use of ἀδελφοί (siblings) at the start of the passage (8:12) suggests that the tenor of the υιοθεσία metaphor is also the believers' horizontal relationships to one another as brothers and sisters. Given that the scope of the metaphor seems to reach beyond the locus of the salvation of the individual believer, using "salvation" as a tenor for the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 is inadequate.

The second possibility of a tenor for the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 is the reception of the Spirit. If this were the case, the metaphor would be expressed as "speaking about the reception of the Spirit in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." This option is attractive because of the prevalence of language about the Spirit in verses 1–16. Even more compelling is that Paul uses λαμβάνειν (receive) twice in verse 15, which as Dunn remarks "certainly refers to the reception of the Spirit."⁸⁵ Similarly, Fitzmyer asserts,

along the continuum than υιοθεσία and could nearly be classified as a conventional metaphor. See also Beardsley, "The Metaphorical Twist," 301–302. However, its metaphorical roots are still apparent and thus it is problematic to use it to "explain" another metaphor because its own set of entailments will inevitably obscure some of the entailments of the other metaphor.

- 82 E.g., Garner states, "'adoption' . . . is that overarching and foundational familial concept *under which* Paul articulates the specific *loci* of soteric blessing" ("Adoption in Christ," 245); see also Trumper, "The Theological History of Adoption II," 198.
- 83 Trebilco uses the categories "vertical" and "horizontal" to describe various self-designations for Christian communities in the New Testament (e.g., οἱ πιστοί and οἱ ἀδελφοί) ("What Shall We Call Each Other? Part One: The Issue of Self-Designations in the Pastoral Epistles," *TynBul* 53.2 [2002]: 239–58). I am suggesting that Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor combines both vertical and horizontal aspects into a single tenor.
- 84 See, e.g., Burke, who labels υιοθεσία an "organizing soteriological metaphor" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 41–45).
- 85 Dunn, *Romans*, vol 1., 451.

“The Spirit received constitutes adoptive sonship.”⁸⁶ However, although it is undoubtedly the case that adoption and the Spirit are intimately connected, there are some difficulties with identifying the tenor of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor with the reception of the Spirit. An examination of the possible translations for verse 15 will reveal that although *υιοθεσία* is described as an event that happens concurrently with the reception of the Spirit, the tenor of the metaphor reaches beyond the event to implicate all three members of the Trinity.

The difficulties with identifying the tenor of *υιοθεσία* with the reception of the Spirit can be seen in the various opinions regarding the meaning of the genitive construction *πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας* (Spirit of *υιοθεσίας*). Barrett argues that *πνεῦμα υιοθεσίας* (Spirit of *υιοθεσίας*) here means “the Spirit which anticipates adoption,”⁸⁷ while Cranfield, argues that it means “the Spirit which brings about our adoption.”⁸⁸ Further possibilities include “the Spirit who confirms our adoption,”⁸⁹ or “the Spirit who produces our adoption.”⁹⁰ Although there is no general consensus as to which of these translations most accurately captures Paul’s intention in verse 15, all of them seem to implicitly assume that there is more involved in a believer’s *υιοθεσία* than the reception of the Spirit. To be sure, the Spirit might be the agent, witness, or anticipator, but a believer’s *υιοθεσία* also involves the Father and the Son. These translations reflect that *υιοθεσία* as a vehicle lends itself more naturally to a more complex and multifaceted tenor—one that in this context involves all three members of the Trinity. Therefore, although the reception of the Spirit accompanies the adoption of the believer, the tenor of the metaphor must aim to encompass the actions of the Father, and Son as well.

A third option for the metaphor’s tenor in 8:15 is the initiation of God’s relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers. Thus this version of the metaphor would read “speaking about the initiation of God’s relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption.” Unlike “salvation,” this construction of the tenor seeks to explicitly encompass both the horizontal and vertical relationships described in the immediate

86 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 500.

87 Barrett, *Romans*, 163.

88 Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 397; See also Dunn, “the spirit which effects adoption, or the spirit which expresses adoption” (*Romans*, vol. 1, 452).

89 Moo, *Romans*, 502. Moo concedes that this translation may be overly subtle, stating “it may be better to think of the Spirit as the agent through whom the believer’s sonship is both bestowed and confirmed” (*ibid.*).

90 Jewett, *Romans*, 498.

context of the metaphor. Moreover, it has the potential to encompass the actions of all three members of the Trinity. The vehicle of the metaphor most naturally lends itself to the Father as the initiator of adoption, the Spirit as the witness, and the Son as the brother and coheir of the adoptees,⁹¹ though each of these claims will need to be addressed in more detail below. This expression of the tenor also seeks to give credence to υιοθεσία being a distinct, but related, concept to the ongoing *status* of sonship.⁹² Thus, υιοθεσία as a vehicle seems to lend itself naturally to a tenor that centers on the *process of becoming a son*. Thus it is distinct from concepts like υιοί (sons), τέκνα (children), or κληρονόμοι (heirs) which are vehicles that lend themselves to the expression of the ongoing status believers enjoy as a result of the act of υιοθεσία. Expressing the tenor as the Trinity's initiation of relationship with the believer and the believer's entrance into the community of believers is a more comprehensive expression of the metaphor's subject, and thus it is preferable to the first two options.

Identifying the tenor in Romans 8:23 likewise presents us with several significant exegetical and interpretive difficulties, many of which arise from the inherent tension between verses 15 and 23. Some commentators have chosen to resolve the seeming contradiction between the two verses by appealing to manuscript evidence where υιοθεσία is omitted from verse 23 entirely, but I have already shown that this is very unlikely.⁹³ The most often cited candidate for the metaphor's tenor is the "redemption of the body" due to the epexegetical construction: υιοθεσίαν. . . τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν (adoption, the redemption of our body). For example, Moo states, "This final element in our adoption is 'the redemption of our bodies.'"⁹⁴ However, we have already seen the difficulty in substituting one metaphor (ἀπολύτρωσις/redemption) for another (υιοθεσία), and thus it is equally problematic to construe the metaphor in verse 23 as "whereby we speak about the redemption of our bodies

91 Burke's analysis also recognizes the role each member of the Trinity plays in the adoption of a believer (see *Adopted into God's Family*, 72–151).

92 There is some debate over whether υιοθεσία in Romans 8:15 refers more to the initial act of adoption or the ongoing status of sonship (which is even seen in the translation choices of "adoption" and "sonship"). See Byrne, "Sons of God," 1–9, 85–126; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 500; Moo, *Romans*, 501–502; Schreiner, *Romans*, 425.

93 See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 504, 510–11; Jewett, *Romans*, 505.

94 Moo, *Romans*, 521. Moo is somewhat unique in his appreciation of the subtle difference between "redemption" and "resurrection," and his analysis indicates that he does not see these terms as entirely interchangeable. He states, "'Redemption' shares with 'adoption' . . . the 'already-not yet' tension that pervades [Paul's] theology, for the redemption can be pictured both as past and as future" (*Romans*, 521).

in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption.” This difficulty is only slightly improved if we substitute “resurrection,” for “redemption.” For example, Cranfield remarks, “The full manifestation of our adoption *is identical with* the final resurrection of our bodies at the Parousia.”⁹⁵ However, although using “the resurrection of the body” would connect *υιοθεσία* with the concrete future action of resurrection, reducing *υιοθεσία* to the resurrection of the body does not reflect the whole tenor of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor.⁹⁶ The difficulty with using the resurrection of the body as the tenor of *υιοθεσία* in verse 23 is that the vehicle *υιοθεσία* is inherently relational. As important as the resurrection of the body is to Pauline theology, resurrection is not relational in and of itself, but rather resurrection points to God as its initiator on account of his relationship with the believers. Rather like the reception of the Spirit in Romans 8:15, resurrection should be seen as something that accompanies *υιοθεσία*, or perhaps is the final evidence of the adoption of the believer, in verse 23.

To be sure, any proposal for the tenor of Romans 8:23 does need to take the relationship between verses 15 and 23 into account, as well as the future-directed perspective of verses 18–25. In light of these considerations, I propose that the tenor of the metaphor in verse 23 is God’s eschatological action toward believers coupled with the believers’ anticipation of those actions. Using Soskice’s formula,⁹⁷ this renders the metaphor, “Speaking about God’s eschatological action toward believers, and the believers’ anticipation of those actions, in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption.” Although this construction might seem cumbersome, it is necessary to state the tenor of the metaphor in terms that are seemingly vague because the totality of God’s eschatological actions toward both creation and believers are not fully known. This is evidenced by the groaning of both creation and the believers as they eagerly wait and hope for things unseen (vv. 24–25). In addition, the tenor of the metaphor lies in the experience of anticipation itself because the locus of meaning seems to be in this shared experience of anticipating God’s final act of adoption. Here in verse 23, Paul’s realized eschatology and the reality of the believers’ experience in Christ through the Spirit must be held together in

95 Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 1, 419; See also Burke, *Adopted into God’s Family*, 189–90; Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 109.

96 Neither can “the redemption of the body” be reduced only to the resurrection. Redemption, too, is more fully orbéd than “resurrection,” which refers solely to the physical raising and eschatological restoration of the body. Redemption implies far more, including the former state of slavery and death that the body labored under, the fallen state of creation, and the freedom that accompany God’s new creation; see also Moo, *Romans*, 520–21.

97 See chapter 2 for a discussion on Soskice’s definition of metaphor.

the metaphor's tenor;⁹⁸ the experience of present groaning and God's eschatological action are both firmly in view.⁹⁹

The Frame: Romans 8:12–25

Black's concept of the "frame" of the metaphor, which is the surrounding context that contributes to the overall meaning of the metaphor,¹⁰⁰ poses an interesting question for the analysis of the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8:15 and 23. In his explanation of "frame," Black limits the term to the sentence in which the metaphor occurs. Under Black's terminology, strictly speaking then, there is a different frame for each *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 8. However, a slight emendation to Black's understanding of "frame" will illuminate the cohesiveness of Paul's two uses of *υιοθεσία* in this context. In keeping with Black's terminology from pictures and artwork, I propose to view the two metaphors in Romans 8 as part of a diptych. By "diptych" I mean that in Romans 8 the two metaphors comprise something of a continuous image divided into two parts and contained in the same overarching frame. Furthermore, although it is almost customary to treat verses 18–25 as a separate section from verses 12–17, these two distinct "frames" are joined by several themes which they share in common. Indeed, running through the entirety of verses 12–25 is the role and activity of the Spirit (vv. 13, 14, 15, 16, 23), the images of bondage and redemption (vv. 12, 15, 21, 23), and most importantly for our purposes here, the motif of adoption and sonship (vv. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23).¹⁰¹

Since there is such a high degree of continuity in the themes in 8:12–25, I will treat these two metaphors as two complementary parts of the same frame. If the meaning of a metaphor is to some degree dependent on its surrounding frame, it is necessary to examine here several of the other important features of verses 12–25 that provide the surrounding structure for the metaphor. The first of these elements is the *σάρξ* (flesh)/*πνεῦμα* (Spirit) dichotomy, which was discussed above. This dichotomy is introduced first in verses 4–9 and continues in verse 12, providing the antithesis for the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in

98 Nils Dahl, "Christ, Creation, and the Church," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964), 432.

99 In addition, there is a strong connection between terms of anticipation in the text surrounding the metaphor and the metaphor's ability to structure and influence the collective experience of the audience members, which will be explored in greater detail below.

100 Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 27–28; see chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation.

101 See also Susan Eastman, "Whose Apocalypse: The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19," *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 266.

verse 15. In Romans 8 the meaning of σάρξ (flesh) is unambiguously negative, and, as Dunn argues, denotes “the weakness and corruptibility of the creature which distances him from the Creator.”¹⁰² Within the context of Romans 8 it is perhaps best to understand σάρξ (flesh) as Paul’s description of fallenness and corruption both of the created order to which the believer is bound in his or her corrupted flesh and of the fallenness of the believer’s moral behavior, which is described in terms of slavery to sin.

The Spirit/flesh dichotomy is important for the υιοθεσία metaphors because of the implied connection between σάρξ (flesh) and slavery and πνεῦμα (Spirit) and adoption. Paul’s dichotomy between being ἐν σαρκί (in the flesh), or being ἐν πνεύματι (in the Spirit) contrasts the outcome of belonging to the present age where sin and death reign with belonging to the new eschatological age where inhabitants experience righteousness, life, and peace.¹⁰³ If the σάρξ (flesh)/πνεῦμα (Spirit) dichotomy is primarily a description of two ages and two modes of existence, then the frame in 8:12–25 presents the υιοθεσία metaphors as *part of an image of transfer* between existence κατὰ σάρκα (according to the flesh) and existence κατὰ πνεῦμα (according to the Spirit). Paul is clear that humans are always under obligation, whether to the flesh or to the Spirit (8:12), and thus υιοθεσία marks the change in the believers’ position, obligation, and allegiance.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, Paul further illuminates the tension between σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) when he describes the believers’ existence κατὰ πνεῦμα (according to the Spirit) in verses 18–25, where the Spirit causes the believers to groan in recognition that the hope of eschatological renewal has not been achieved, and cannot realize full expression in their unredeemed bodies.¹⁰⁵

A second important feature that provides the structure of the frame surrounding the metaphor is Paul’s emphasis on suffering, hope, and glory. In Romans 8, Paul is quite clear that receiving the Spirit of adoption is inextricably linked to becoming a co-sufferer with Christ (vv. 15–17), and indeed the believers must become co-sufferers prior to their glorification with Christ (8:17). As the frame of the metaphor unfolds, the suffering Paul speaks of is also intimately connected to life in the Spirit, and it seems to arise from the believers’ acute realization that they are caught up in the eschatological tension between the now and not yet. The groaning of believers in verse 23

¹⁰² Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 363.

¹⁰³ Moo, *Romans*, 489.

¹⁰⁴ Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 250.

¹⁰⁵ Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 490; see also Richard Bauckham, “The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Rom 8:18–23,” *RevExp* 108 (2011): 96.

simultaneously expresses the suffering of the believers wrought by their experience of displacement, but also their hopeful yearning for eschatological redemption.¹⁰⁶ The themes of suffering, hope, and glory are also expanded to a cosmic scale in verses 18–25, where creation waits with longing, and the sons of God groan in solidarity with creation awaiting God's eschatological action of final restoration. In these verses, Paul's vision of authentic hope is grounded in the experience of suffering, yet it looks toward the horizon of eschatological renewal on a cosmic scale.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, in Romans 8:12–25 Paul combines the cosmic horizon of hope with the intimate and familial action of adoption, which gives voice and purpose to the believers' groaning as they await God's final eschatological action.

A final, albeit somewhat implicit component of the frame in verses 12–25 is the activity of the Trinity that undergirds the entirety of the passage.¹⁰⁸ The Spirit leads, bears witness, and groans together with the spirit of believers (vv. 26–27), marking the believers' transition from enslavement to the flesh to sonship of God. The Father is implicitly the agent who initiates the adoption of the believers, evidenced by the *'abbā* cry in verse 15. By extension, the Father is the initiator of the revelation of the children of God at the end of the age, and also the one who subjected creation to futility. The Son is named as the brother and heir of the adopted sons, and the *σύν* prefixes suggest not only solidarity in kinship, but perhaps even participation in the person of Christ. In addition, Paul makes an implicit connection between the resurrection of the Son and the hope of redemption of believers' bodies.¹⁰⁹

Emphasis and Resonance

Of the four occurrences of *υἱοθεσία* metaphors in Romans and Galatians, the two occurrences in Romans 8 are arguably the two most emphatic. Recall that a metaphor is emphatic to the degree that it will not brook the substitution of another word or words.¹¹⁰ In Romans 8 the *υἱοθεσία* metaphors draw attention to the mode of entrance into sonship specifically, and the ongoing status comes into full view as Paul's train of thought develops further and as more kinship terms appear. If we consider the metaphor as a description of the method of entrance, then it is clear that *υἱοθεσία* provides quite a specific

106 Bauckham, "The Story of the Earth," 96.

107 J. Christiaan Beker, "Suffering and Triumph in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *HBT* 7.2 (1985): 106.

108 See also Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*, 72–151; idem, "Adopted as Sons," 267–78.

109 See also Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 255–66.

110 Black, "More about Metaphor," 26.

and unique description of this entrance.¹¹¹ Indeed, the image of υιοθεσία as a depiction of a believer's passage to sonship is clearly not replaceable by other descriptions of entrance to sonship (e.g., birth) or by general kinship terms which imply the status achieved by υιοθεσία (e.g., υἱός/son and τέκνον/child). The case for emphasis is particularly strong in Romans 8:23, where the υιοθεσία metaphor occurs in rather jarring contrast to the imagery of birth and travail that dominates the landscape in the preceding verses. As Burke remarks, "[T]he suspension of the biological imagery of natural birth (vv. 19–22) used to describe the non-human order and the subsequent shift to the new imagery of adoption (vv. 23–25) needs to be properly recognized."¹¹² Paul is clear in both occurrences of the metaphor that the believers' sonship is achieved by their *adoption to sonship*, and not by any other means, making each instance emphatic according to Black's definition.

The two occurrences of υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 are also arguably the most resonant of the instances of Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors. Recall that Black defines resonant metaphors as "utterances that support a high degree of implicative elaboration."¹¹³ In the case of verse 15 Paul names some of the implications explicitly, such as the cry of Αββα ὁ πατήρ (*abbā*, Father) and the connection between adoption and inheritance that continues in verse 16. The connection between the υιοθεσία metaphor and the ensuing related terms led Käsemann to remark of verses 16–17, "The consequences of sonship are mentioned in order to show its irreversibility."¹¹⁴ I would further suggest that Paul's explication of these particular implications might indicate that other implications (e.g., the believers as brothers and sisters) are also latent in the metaphor in verse 15.

In contrast, the metaphor in verse 23 is possibly less resonant since it is set in an exegetical construction with ἀπολύτρωσιν/redemption. This construction has caused some to conclude that υιοθεσίαν is subsumed under the metaphor of redemption, which would make redemption the more resonant metaphor of the pair.¹¹⁵ However, the resonance of the metaphor in verse 15 reverberates through the subsequent verses, making further elaboration in verse 23 unnecessary. Moreover, both redemption and adoption in verse 23 are resonant

111 See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 3–61 for the lexical evidence for words in the semantic domain of "adoption."

112 Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.

113 Black, "More About Metaphor," 26.

114 Käsemann, *Romans*, 229.

115 E.g., Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 279–86; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 491; Käsemann, *Romans*, 237; Osborne, *Romans*, 209; Schreiner, *Romans*, 439.

metaphors, and that the implications of each metaphor build upon the implications of the other.¹¹⁶ The interplay between the two metaphors in verse 23, redemption and adoption, highlights the tension between the two modes of existence outlined in the frame. Thus, rather than diminishing the level of resonance in verse 23 the juxtaposition of adoption and redemption in verse 23 likely functions to increase the resonance of both metaphors (redemption and adoption), rendering each occurrence of *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 both emphatic and resonant.

Metaphor and Audience

In the previous section I examined various elements of the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors that were bound to the text and delineated their subjects and relationship to the surrounding context more precisely. In this section the task is to move beyond the confines of the text to explore the possible ways the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 shaped the perceptions, emotions, and identity of Paul's audience. I have shown in chapter three that metaphors are powerful and active agents, rather than neutral conduits of information, capable of altering and influencing the perceptions of the hearer/reader.¹¹⁷ Thus I will here examine the cognitive structure that is created by Paul's two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8, and how this structure might have influenced the perception of his audience by highlighting and hiding certain aspects of their Christian experience. Coupled with questions pertaining to cognitive structure, this section will also proffer a suggestion for the emotional response evoked by these two metaphors. The last question this section will address is how the cognitive structure and emotional content of the metaphors might work together to form bonds between members of Paul's community. Since I argued above that the two metaphors in Romans 8 should be treated as two parts of a diptych, here too I will treat them as complementary expressions within a single unit of thought. This is not necessarily to say that each metaphor produces precisely the same cognitive structure, but rather to recognize that they occur in such close proximity that it would be artificial to treat them as two discrete units producing neatly separable sets of cognitive structures and emotions.

¹¹⁶ See Fauconnier and Turner, "Rethinking Metaphor," 54–61.

¹¹⁷ See chapter 3 for a fuller discussion.

Metaphor and Perception

I argued in chapter three that metaphors influence the perception of their hearers by providing a particular cognitive structure which is created in the mind of the hearer by the metaphor's vehicle.¹¹⁸ This cognitive structure highlights and hides features of the metaphor's tenor, thereby influencing and altering the perception of the audience member.¹¹⁹ Thus the first task here is to elucidate the cognitive structure created by the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8, and the second task is to consider what features of the tenor are highlighted and hidden by this structure. A key preliminary observation to this discussion is to note that the cognitive structure evoked by the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 has both vertical and horizontal dimensions. To be more specific, the cognitive structure touches on both how the audience member perceives himself or herself in relation to God and in relation to other members of the community.¹²⁰ Moreover, the interplay between the two metaphors creates a cognitive structure with temporal dimensions as well. While the vertical dimension of the cognitive structure has been extensively investigated, the horizontal and temporal structures of the metaphor have been somewhat neglected.¹²¹ I will examine each of these dimensions in turn, focusing more attention on the two areas that have perhaps been partially overlooked by other studies.

Cognitive Framework and Romans 8:15 and 23

The vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure created by the metaphor involve both adoption as a "method of entrance" or "method of kinship formation" and the ensuing status of sonship and privilege of inheritance that adoption achieves. Paul's use of *υιοθεσία* as a metaphor for kinship formation between God and humanity is both rare and emphatic,¹²² though the image of adoption was widely available in the surrounding culture.¹²³ I have already discussed above that in Romans 8, *υιοθεσία* as a method of entrance into

118 See chapter 3; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 44–47.

119 Lakoff and Turner, *More Than Cool Reason*, passim.

120 See also Trebilco, "What Shall We Call Each Other?," 239–58.

121 Garner's thesis addresses the metaphors' temporal dimensions, though his theological reading does not seek to answer questions regarding the metaphors' affective potential ("Adoption in Christ," 41–55); Byrne and Burke also address the eschatological cast of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors to varying degrees in their respective studies (Byrne, "*Sons of God*," 103–126); (Burke, *Adopted Into God's Family*, 177–93).

122 See chapter 2 for a discussion on emphasis.

123 For a survey of the lexical evidence see Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 13–60; see also Jewett, *Romans*, 498; Peppard, *The Son of God*, 50–85.

sonship is closely linked with the reception of the Spirit.¹²⁴ However, it is also necessary to differentiate between the metaphor of adoption and the experience of receiving the Spirit, which is the event Paul links to the metaphor (8:15). I discussed in chapter three that one of the functions of a metaphor can be to provide a cognitive structure for a particular experience or set of experiences, and this is precisely how the *υιοθεσία* metaphors are functioning in Romans 8:15 and 8:23. That is to say that in verse 15 the *υιοθεσία* metaphor provides the believer with a particular cognitive structure for the experience of receiving the Holy Spirit.

The cognitive structure *υιοθεσία* creates for the experience of receiving the Spirit also entails the activity and agency of all three members of the Trinity. The metaphor evokes the familiar cultural image of adoption in which the Father (*paterfamilias*) is the initiator of the adoption. In this respect, as Peppard observes, “[T]he imagery is perfectly in line with our knowledge about adoption in Roman society.”¹²⁵ Thus the vertical aspects of the cognitive structure that *υιοθεσία* creates depicts the relationship forged between the believer and the Father as the prerogative of the Father. The vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure constructed by the metaphor in Romans 8:15 is one of call and response, of initiation and acknowledgment.

Through the metaphor the believer is led to understand that the Father has extended him or her sonship by divine initiative, and the believer is led to respond by acknowledging God as Father in the intimate cry of the heart through the Spirit. Moreover, the believer’s cry roots him or her firmly in the cry of Jesus the Son. When they receive adoption, believers not only become sons of the Father, they also adopt the perspective of Jesus; likewise, they share his view of the Father.¹²⁶ Moreover, the cognitive framework created by *υιοθεσία* also entails the status believers are granted by virtue of their *υιοθεσία*. Following the Father’s initiation of sonship in 8:15, verse 17 links the status of sonship with the further designations *κληρονόμοι* and *συγκληρονόμοι* . . . Χριστοῦ (heirs and co-heirs together with Christ). These designations are clearly entailments of the cognitive structure created by *υιοθεσία* in verse 15, as inheritance and adoption are closely linked in the underlying cultural model of Roman adoption practices.¹²⁷ Moreover, by using a *σύν* prefix Paul again builds a

124 This is not to say that the tenor of the metaphor is the reception of the Spirit, but rather Paul connects *υιοθεσία* to the event of receiving the Spirit.

125 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 135.

126 Sigve Tonstad, “The Revisionary Potential of ‘Abba! Father’ in the Letters of Paul,” *AUSS* 45.1 (2007): 11.

127 See Peppard, *The Son of God*, 135–140; Walters, “Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance,” 51–55.

cognitive structure where the believers' sonship and Christ's sonship are intimately connected.

However, in considering the vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure in relation to 8:23 some complications arise. As we have already seen, the tension between 8:15 and 8:23 is well documented, but it is perhaps less clear what impact the tension between "receiving the Spirit of adoption" and "eagerly awaiting adoption" has on the cognitive structure produced by the interaction between the two metaphors in Romans 8. Branick argues that the tension between verses 15 and 18 "suggests the beginnings of realized eschatology. The result is not a clear eschatological picture, worked out with systematic consistency, but rather an inconsistent picture, one of internal tensions."¹²⁸ However, far from muddying the cognitive structure, the tension between the two metaphors in Romans 8 in fact enriches the believer's perception of the activity of the Trinity. The Father is not only the Father who initiates the adoption of the believer, but he is also the one who will redeem creation from its bondage, and for whom the believer longingly awaits. The Spirit is not only the Spirit who testifies to adoption, but also the Spirit who groans and intercedes for the believer as he or she waits for the revelation of the sons of God (v. 21). The Son is not only the coheir, but also the believer's brother, co-sufferer, and the source of hope for the resurrection of the body (vv. 23–25). The tension between the two metaphors is mirrored in the actions of the Trinity, further emphasizing the perception of a familial bond within the believers.

In addition to the vertical dimensions of the υιοθεσία metaphor which are already well-worn avenues of exegesis,¹²⁹ the cognitive structure created by the υιοθεσία also has several strong horizontal components.¹³⁰ The horizontal axis of the metaphor is most clearly seen in Paul's choice to express the υιοθεσία of believers using plural nouns and verbs (ἐλάβετε/you all received, κρᾶζομεν/we cry out, πνεύματι ἡμῶν/our spirit, ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ/we are God's children).¹³¹ The cognitive structure created by Paul's use of plural forms also creates the perception of horizontal kinship relationships between the members of his audience who are included in the scope of these plural designations. As a

128 Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul," 670.

129 See especially Burke, *Adopted into God's Family*; Byrne, "Sons of God"; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*.

130 Pace Aasgaard who sees only vertical dimensions in Rom 8:15–29 ("My Beloved Brothers and Sisters," 145–50).

131 See also Gordon Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 585; Marianne Meye Thompson, *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament* (Louisville: WJK, 2000), 129.

performative utterance, the metaphor enacts a mental simulation in the minds of the audience where other community members are understood as brothers and sisters of the same family. Having all entered into sonship by the same means (υἰοθεσία), believers are further united under the communal designations κληρονόμοι and συγκληρονόμοι... Χριστοῦ (heirs and co-heirs together with Christ), and through the communal activities of συμπάσχομεν (we suffer together [with Christ]) and ἵνα συνδοξασθῶμεν (so that we might be glorified together [with Christ]). Paul's language here is striking in that it suggests that the believers' adoption unites them to Christ (seen in the σύν prefixes) and at the same time binds them to other members of the community as co-sharers in the adoption (seen in the first-person plural verb forms). Moreover, Paul is not speaking about suffering in general that leads to glory (8:17), but rather the trajectory from suffering to glory is the central plot of Christ's own story in which the believers participate together with him.¹³² The link between the horizontal and the vertical dimensions of the cognitive structure is further confirmed later in Romans 8 where Christ is designated πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (firstborn among many brothers and sisters) (8:29).

The temporal aspects of the cognitive structure the two metaphors create when taken together are perhaps the most difficult to grasp, or at least the most difficult to adequately capture. How is it possible that believers are described as both "sons/children" (υἱοί/τέκνα) who have received the Spirit of υἰοθεσία (8:15–16) and yet are eagerly awaiting υἰοθεσία (Rom 8:23)?¹³³ Or even perhaps more fundamentally, what cognitive framework is in play for Paul to even begin to speak of believers in this state of "caught between-ness?" As I have stated already, the exegetical tension between Paul's statements that believers "have received the Spirit of υἰοθεσία" in verse 15 and that believers also "groan inwardly, eagerly awaiting υἰοθεσία, the redemption of our bodies" in verse 23 has usually been resolved by appealing to Paul's "already/not yet" eschatology. However, the scholarly familiarity of the Pauline "already/not yet" eschatology potentially masks the deep eschatological and *existential* tension present in the cognitive structure that Paul creates through his use of the two υἰοθεσία metaphors. In order to break free from the familiarity of the "already/not yet" understanding of Romans 8, it is more helpful to view the cognitive structure created by the two metaphors as one of temporal displacement. To clarify, the υἰοθεσία metaphor in Romans 8:15 creates a cognitive structure that causes

132 J. R. Daniel Kirk, "Appointed Son(s): An Exegetical Note on Romans 1:4 and 8:29," *BBR* 14.2 (2004): 241.

133 See also Schlier's fourfold description of believers as sons of God (*Römerbrief*, 252).

the readers and hearers to perceive time (this present age and the age to come), and their relationship to it, differently.

Having received the Spirit of adoption, the believers move not only from slavery to sonship, but also from possessing the mindset of the flesh to possessing the mindset of the Spirit (vv. 6–7). The Spirit is associated with the age to come (v. 23), and flesh and slavery are associated with the bondage of this present age (vv. 14–15; 18–21). Thus if Paul has utilized *υιοθεσία* as a metaphor to convey the change between slavery and sonship evidenced by the reception of the eschatological Spirit, then by extension the cognitive structure created by the metaphors creates a change in the way the believers perceive time. Dunn contends, “The gift of the Spirit disturbs and disrupts what was previously a settled pattern.”¹³⁴ This disruption is precisely what Paul captures in his juxtaposition of the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8. If believers have received the eschatological gift of the Spirit and also enjoy the eschatological status of “son/child,” then, in some sense, the cognitive structure of the metaphor entails that they perceive themselves as existing within or according to the age to come. However, the future aspect of *υιοθεσία* in verse 23 simultaneously proffers a cognitive framework which entails that believers also perceive their existence according to “this present time” (v. 18) while they groan and anxiously await their adoption. Moo summarizes the change in the believers’ cognitive structure this way: “The very fact that the Spirit is only the ‘first fruits’ makes us sadly conscious that we have ‘not yet’ severed all ties to the old age of sin and death.”¹³⁵ Thus, the cognitive structure that these metaphors effect creates the perception for believers that they are somewhat uncomfortably caught between the two ages.¹³⁶

Moreover, the changes in the aspect of the verbs as one moves through the passage reinforces this sense of displacement in the corresponding mental simulations of the audience. Paul begins his discussion of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor by connecting it to *ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα* (you received the Spirit). The aorist tense here evokes a mental simulation of a completed action and focuses the believers’ attention on the results of this event, which Paul goes on to name explicitly at the end of the sentence: *ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν, Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ* (in whom we cry ‘*abbā*, Father’).¹³⁷ The shift in aspect from completed to progressive yields “greater embodied simulation of the process, or nucleus, of the described

134 Dunn, “Spirit Speech,” 87.

135 Moo, *Romans*, 520.

136 See also Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 489–91; J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 279.

137 See Bergen, *Louder Than Words*, 117.

event,¹³⁸ which means that Paul's words here create a vivid simulation of the act of crying out to the Father. This vivid embodied simulation continues through συμπάσχομεν (we suffer together), and in στενάζομεν υιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι (we groan, eagerly awaiting our adoption). The mental simulations created by Paul's language in 8:15–23 focus attention on the progressive action of verbs that together highlight the experience of belonging to God and the corresponding displacement in time (crying out, groaning, waiting expectantly). Likewise Paul indicates that creation's attention is also focused on the displacement of the sons, and it too is groaning and travailing as it awaits their revelation (vv. 18–22). In this case, the third-person forms in the description evoke mental simulations from an observer's point of view.¹³⁹ Thus the believers imagine that all of creation looks to them as it is waiting and longing, even as they themselves are in the process of waiting and longing for resolution to their temporal displacement.

The combination of vertical, horizontal, and temporal dimensions in the cognitive structure created by the two υιοθεσία metaphors has significant ramifications for the ways the metaphors influence the perception of the audience members. The use of υιοθεσία as a vertical description for the believer's relationship with God simultaneously provides a framework through which the believer perceives the Triune God as the initiator of an intimate, filial relationship, and also perceives himself or herself in that relationship as a son of God. The metaphors also forge a cognitive structure with horizontal dimensions that lead the believer to perceive the other members of his or her community as co-sons, co-heirs, co-sufferers, and co-groaners awaiting God's final act of adoption together. The horizontal dimensions of the cognitive framework also yield the perception that the believers are drawn together into community by their collective relationship to Christ, their brother and the firstborn (v. 29). Moreover, when taken together the two υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 create a cognitive framework that produces the perception of temporal displacement within the audience members. Their adoption creates the perception that they have been transferred into the age of the Spirit, which means that they in some sense perceive their existence according to the age to come. However, the framework also necessitates that they simultaneously perceive that they are still awaiting the full expression of that transfer, and that they somehow also still exist and suffer within this present age. These two seemingly contradictory frameworks produce the perception of an acute eschatological tension

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 114.

that is not only recognized intellectually but also, as I will argue in more detail below, experienced at a profoundly existential level.

Highlighting and Hiding in Romans 8

These three dimensions (vertical, horizontal, and temporal) of the cognitive framework effected by the two metaphors actively highlight some aspects of the believers' relationship to God and to one another while hiding and obscuring others.¹⁴⁰ This section will examine these potential areas by considering the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 in relation to the internal and external evidence regarding the makeup of Paul's audience and what issues would have been of particular concern to them and to Paul. Having recognized that metaphors are powerful agents of persuasion that actively influence the perception of their hearers/readers,¹⁴¹ the question here in the exegesis is what potential elements of God's activity, the believers' relationship to God and each other, and the believers' understanding of time and eschatology are highlighted through the cognitive framework constructed by the two metaphors in Romans 8.

As discussed earlier, the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 provides a particular structure through which the believer perceives his or her vertical relationship to God, and through which she or he also perceives God's activity toward the believers. What elements in particular does this structure highlight and hide? Furthermore, it must be recognized at the outset that this framework is not the only, or even the primary framework through which the audience perceives their vertical relationship,¹⁴² and thus the analysis must also seek to recognize the limitations of the cognitive structure, which are complemented by other metaphors elsewhere in Romans.

The first vertical element that *υιοθεσία* highlights quite clearly is the divine initiative and activity of making sons of Paul's audience members in Rome. The cognitive structure of the metaphors frames the status of sonship as something that God achieves through adoption, not as a status that people achieve

140 See chapter 3 for a more thorough treatment of this feature; see also Lakoff and Turner, *More than Cool Reason*, 60–70; Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 381.

141 See chapter 3; see also Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric," 47–70; Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 139–46.

142 Burke recognizes this as well, stating, "I am not saying that adoption is the most significant of other Pauline soteriological metaphors," but rather he recognizes that "Paul's understanding of what God in Jesus Christ has done for sinful humanity is so rich, diverse and kaleidoscopic that it ought not to be reduced to a single expression" (*Adopted into God's Family*, 37–38).

or attain to. Adoption is not “natural” sonship, but rather it is sonship that is extended through God’s divine choice and will.¹⁴³ The theocentric emphasis of the metaphor, which highlights God’s activity, is further seen in the believers’ cry “*abbā*, Father” rather than “I am God’s son.”¹⁴⁴ Moreover, the believers are passively described as those who “receive the Spirit of adoption,” again highlighting the Spirit’s activity within the vertical relationship. As the Spirit enables the believers to call upon the Father, the believers as sons also stand alongside Christ who is the preeminent son, co-participants in both his suffering and his glory (8:17). In verse 23 the metaphor creates some space for the response of the believer to the divine activity, but Paul’s prescribed response to the reception of the Spirit is to eagerly wait and long for God’s final restorative actions.

Coupled with its emphasis on divine activity, the cognitive framework of *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 also highlights the impartiality of God, which is a clear focus of the letter to the Romans as whole (1:16; 2:11–16; 3:9, 19–20, 30; 4:9; 5:12–21; 9:24; 10:12; 11:32; 14:1–12; 15:7–13). Although divine impartiality is closely connected with the justice of God’s judgment in Romans,¹⁴⁵ it is also integrally connected with Paul’s understanding of God’s redemptive and salvific action towards both Jews and gentiles. As Bassler aptly states, “God’s impartiality in judgment is matched by his impartiality in grace.”¹⁴⁶ Paul has argued strongly in previous chapters that God’s ministry transcends outward ethnic and religious designations of Jew and gentile (e.g., 2:28–29; 3:9–19, 29–30; 4:11–12),¹⁴⁷ and in the context of Romans 8, God acts without distinction to impart the Spirit of adoption to all who are in Christ Jesus (8:1). Likewise, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor further undergirds the theme of God’s impartiality that runs throughout the letter by providing an avenue of kinship formation apart from biological lineage and ethnicity. Jewett argues, “This link between Spirit and divine sonship . . . defines the varied groups of believers in Rome as God’s family, adopted by him through the Spirit into a position of extraordinary honor.”¹⁴⁸ However, this is not to say that the cognitive framework created by *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8

143 Dunn, “Spirit Speech,” 83.

144 Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Pillar New Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 316; for a more detailed discussion of the origin and use of the *abbā* cry see chapter 5.

145 See e.g., Jouette M. Bassler, “Divine Impartiality in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” *NovT* 26.1 (1984): 45–49.

146 Ibid., 54.

147 See Richard Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Essays on Paul as Interpreter of Israel’s Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 69.

148 Jewett, *Romans*, 497.

does away with ethnic distinctions, but rather it provides a structure through which those of differing ethnic backgrounds can be made sons of the same family through the impartial divine initiative of God.¹⁴⁹

There are several important features that the horizontal dimension of the cognitive framework highlights for the believers in terms of how they perceive their relationship to other community members. First, the cognitive framework forged by *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 highlights the equality between members of the community and emphasizes for the believers that sonship is not based on ethnicity or religious background, but rather is based on the adopting activity of God (Father, Son, and Spirit). Furthermore, all believers have received sonship through the divine initiative of God, and all are heirs and subordinate to the firstborn, Christ (8:29). Moreover, in Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphors there is no hint of the sibling rivalry found in Roman literature,¹⁵⁰ where inheritance was a chief culprit for sparking discord among siblings, especially in instances of adoption.¹⁵¹ Rather paradoxically, in Paul's construal of the metaphor, Jesus, the "firstborn," endeavors to make more sons for God the Father, increasing the size of the family and "diluting" his inheritance.¹⁵²

The cognitive structure of the metaphor also effectively hides those ethnic and religious boundaries that would inhibit some members from forming intimate bonds with members of different backgrounds from themselves by

149 See also J. Christiaan Beker, "The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans," *HTR* 79 (1986): 10–16. Beker claims, "Paul's emphasis on the equality of Jew and Greek in the body of Christ does not nullify the distinctiveness of both peoples. . . . [I]t is wrong to suppose that the emphasis on *pas* or *anthrōpos* blots out the ethnic specificity of two different peoples, Jews and Gentiles," (*Ibid.*, 13). Beker's analysis is correct in that Paul's argument in Romans does not do away with ethnic distinctions, but Beker's classification of Jews and gentiles as "two different peoples" is problematic in that it does not recognize that the label "gentile" is a generic term for all outsiders to the Jewish community, and does not necessarily pick out a specific ethnic designation (see also Paul Trebilco, "Creativity at the Boundary: Features of the Linguistic and Conceptual Construction of Outsiders in the Pauline Corpus," *NTS* 60.2 (2014): 185–201).

150 Plutarch warns against rivalry and jealousy among siblings stating "It is therefore of no slight importance to resist the spirit of contentiousness and jealousy among brothers when it first creeps in over trivial matters, practicing the art of making mutual concessions, of learning to take defeat, and of taking pleasure in indulging brothers rather than winning victories over them" (*Frat. amor.* 488a).

151 This is especially evident in Imperial adoptions; see e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.25–69 on the relationship between Britannicus and Nero; Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, 69.20 on Hadrian's adoption; on sibling rivalry between biological siblings see Luke 15:11–32; Sir 33:20–24; Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.3.5–18; Aasgaard, "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters," 77–81.

152 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 140.

designating all members from all backgrounds with the same status of “adopted son.” Hodge rightly remarks, “In Paul the Spirit serves as a version of ‘shared blood.’”¹⁵³ Thus the metaphor functions as an equalizer by creating the perception among believers that those ethnic and religious differences have become of secondary importance to the unity achieved by becoming adopted sons of the same family where they are all subordinate to Christ as the first-born son (Rom 8:29).

The horizontal dimensions of the cognitive structure constructed by the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 also highlight the solidarity between members by connecting their adoption to their shared experience of suffering and longing for God’s final restorative action. Thus the two metaphors create the perception of a commonly held experience of God’s initiating act of adoption, and they also highlight the shared experience of the community of believers by structuring this experience through the cognitive framework of adoption. Beker argues convincingly that in Romans 8 “the call to suffering is here a call by the Spirit and involves *the communal solidarity and activity of the body of Christ*.”¹⁵⁴ In addition, the experience of suffering and communal solidarity is drawn firmly into view through the framework of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8. Conversely, the metaphors’ ability to create the perception of solidarity by highlighting the shared experience of community members also might aid in diminishing some of the ongoing differences between members of the community in Rome by refocusing their attention to the common bond of kinship forged by adoption.

The temporal dimensions of the cognitive framework created by the two metaphors in Romans 8 serve to highlight the profound temporal displacement of those who have “received the Spirit of adoption” and yet are still eagerly awaiting God’s final act of adoption in the age to come. The disjunctive temporal framework created by the metaphors serves to emphasize the believers’ separation from “the present age,” creating the internal perception that they belong to a different mode of existence as those who have received the adoption, resulting in sighing and groaning for their final restoration. Moo argues that Romans 8 communicates “a necessary and appropriate sense of ‘incompleteness’ in our Christian experience and a consequent and eager longing for that incompleteness to be overcome.”¹⁵⁵ This framework created by the

153 Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 76. Though in her analysis Hodge limits the scope of adoption to “the gentiles,” the likelihood of a minority of Jews in Paul’s audience coupled with the adoption metaphor predicated of Israel in Rom 9:4 makes such a limitation unwarranted.

154 Beker, “Suffering and Triumph,” 111 (emph. mine).

155 Moo, *Romans*, 510.

two *υιοθεσία* metaphors highlights the expectation of eschatological hope, as God's future restorative action is linked to the reception of the Spirit which testifies to the reality of the believers' adoption.

Alternately, the temporal dimensions of the cognitive framework somewhat hide the believers' ongoing connections to "this present age," or at least frames these connections ambivalently at best, and perhaps even negatively, by highlighting instead the longing for the age to come. The outlook of the framework is decidedly forward looking, though this hope is founded in Christ's own suffering and redemption.¹⁵⁶ Indeed, both hope and suffering in this present age serve to highlight the believers' connection to the age to come. The presence of suffering is itself a sign that the present age is passing away, and that in the midst of the clash between the two ages believers can have confidence in the surety of eschatological liberation.¹⁵⁷ God's act of cosmic renewal has already begun through the mission of his Son. Thus the temporal dimension of the metaphors' framework accentuates the perception of temporal displacement for the believer as it highlights the temporal dimensions of belonging both to the eschatological family of God, but also continuing to exist and suffer within the present age.

Metaphor and Emotion

The emotive vocabulary and images in Romans 8 are so prevalent and poignant that interpreters of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 have long noted their emotional content.¹⁵⁸ Moo observes, "Indeed, what Paul says here calls into question whether one can have a genuine experience of God's Spirit of adoption without its affecting the emotions."¹⁵⁹ There is much more reflection on the emotive potential of the two metaphors in Romans 8 than of the other instances of *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 9:4 and Galatians 4:5. Many themes in the passage containing the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors have a strong capacity to elicit an emotional response from the audience members, including family intimacy, inheritance, suffering, groaning, slavery, redemption, hope, and glorification. As discussed earlier, a key component to understanding a metaphor is to experience the attendant emotions the metaphor creates.¹⁶⁰ Thus in the case of recovering the emotional content of the metaphors, part of the

156 Rudolf Pesch, *Römerbrief* (NEchtB 6, Würzburg: Echter, 1994), 71.

157 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 486–87.

158 See especially Jewett, *Romans*, 478–530; Moo, *Romans*, 499–505. Both Jewett and Moo pay particularly close attention to Paul's emotive language.

159 Moo, *Romans*, 502.

160 See chapter 3.

exegetical task is to enter into the mindset of Paul's first hearers and attempt to experience and understand the emotions that they would have upon hearing the metaphors in Romans 8 for the first time. The analysis below will attempt to identify the emotions present in the text by first utilizing Booth's narrative framework and then by identifying the emotions present in the text using Kövecses' metaphors of emotion.

The narrative in Romans 8 is considerably more complex than the narrative in Galatians 4, which was examined in the previous chapter. Although Romans 8 is not typically treated as narrative, it should be recognized as a retelling of the Christ-event that highlights the relationship between the coming of Christ and the Spirit with the liberation and adoption of the believers as sons/children (υἱοί/τέκνα) of God. Beginning in verse 1, the audience is invited into a narrative world where Christ Jesus has dealt with sin and God has "condemned sin in the flesh (κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί (v. 3)" for those who are "in Christ" (v. 1) and who "walk according to the Spirit (περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα (v. 4))." The narrative continues to describe the two dichotomous experiences and destinies for those who walk/exist according to the flesh, and those who walk/exist according to the Spirit (vv. 5–17).

The two endpoints of lives according to the flesh and lives according to the Spirit are in utter opposition: one leads to death (v. 6) and is hostile to God (v. 7), and the other leads to life (v. 6, 10), peace (v. 6), sonship/childship (vv. 12–17), and inheritance (v. 17). However, the narrative makes it apparent that the main characters (the audience) are among those who walk according to the Spirit, though Paul does qualify this assumption in verse 9 with the phrase "if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. If anyone does not have the Spirit, this one is not his" (εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ). However, the shift to the indefinite pronoun τις (anyone) in the latter half of the verse presents the option of the Spirit not dwelling in the audience members as a hypothetical situation, as if to assure them of the opposite. Since the Spirit of God dwells in them, they can be assured that they are his.

The plural first person and second person pronouns throughout Romans 8:1–28 focus the narrative on its central characters: Paul and his audience members. Although it may seem strange to speak of the audience members as characters in a narrative, it is clear that the narrative of Romans 8 presents Paul's version of the audience members' story; he narrates the story he wants them to hear regarding the significance of their experience of life in the Spirit. Unlike the narrative in Galatians 4:1–7 where there is a clear comparison to a situation in a Greco-Roman household, Paul does not draw any analogies here, and moreover, the pronouns unambiguously refer to all of his audience

members.¹⁶¹ The first and second person pronouns are then modified by several descriptions which add depth to the characterization of the audience: they “walk according to the Spirit,” (v. 4) they “exist according to the Spirit,” (v. 5), they are “in the Spirit” (v. 9), and they are “sons,” “children,” and “heirs” (vv. 14–17). These descriptions are internalized by Paul’s audience members, and the narrative molds them “into its limited shapes,”¹⁶² so that they become the kind of people characterized in the narrative.

Moreover, as the audience identifies with the first and second person pronouns in the narrative they are invited to experience the tension and conflict that has resulted from experiencing the firstfruits of the Spirit and yet awaiting the final redemption of all of creation. Booth observes that when a narrative invites its readers/hearers to participate, “A large part of [the readers’] thought-stream is *taken over*, for at least the duration of the telling, by the story [they] are taking in.”¹⁶³ Thus, the groaning of the characters in the narrative becomes their own groaning; the hope of those awaiting adoption becomes the audience’s hope. When they accept Paul’s characterization of their experience in the Spirit, the audience is led to experience the acute eschatological and existential tension of the narrative.

As the narrative progresses toward the *υιοθεσία* metaphors, Paul leaves behind those who walk according to the flesh, and continues with an affirmation of sonship/childship and inheritance for those who are in the Spirit, which further confirms for the audience that Paul intends them to view themselves as participants in the latter group of people. Within this narrative, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in verse 15 functions as an image of transfer that assures the characters of the “you” and “we” (the audience) that they have crossed from existence according to the flesh to existence as sons/children who live according to the Spirit. To this assurance Paul also adds an element of conflict, or tension, in his assertion that the sons/children and co-heirs with Christ must also suffer with Christ before they are glorified with him (v. 17). This tension continues into the final section of the narrative, where the sons/children are suffering (v. 18) and groaning (v. 23) as they eagerly hope for and await the final redemption of creation (v. 21), and their own final redemption and adoption (vv. 21, 23). The *υιοθεσία* metaphor in verse 23 highlights the sense of displacement the characterized audience feels as a result of their being stuck between the ages. The narrative concludes on a hopeful note, where the Spirit intercedes for the audience members and helps them in their weakness (vv. 26–27), and they are

161 See the discussion above on the composition of Paul’s audience.

162 Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 204.

163 Ibid., 141.

further assured that although the present time is marked by suffering, the final result will be their glorification (v. 28).

In addition to the audience as the main character in the narrative of Romans 8, Paul introduces several minor characters whose function is to bring out various elements of the main characters' narrative journey. At the beginning of the narrative, Paul uses "those who walk/exist according to the flesh" as a foil for the main characters, who "walk according to the Spirit" in order to highlight the disparate destinies of these two groups of people. Toward the end of the narrative, the groaning of creation functions in a similar way, augmenting the tension in the narrative and bringing the eager expectation of the audience members into sharper relief. Creation's natural cycle of birth and death is disrupted, its present suffering strains forward in hope as its gaze is directed toward the revelation of the sons of God.¹⁶⁴

Unlike the narrative in Galatians 4:1–7, the Father does not play a major role in the narrative in Romans 8. Rather, the figure of the Father looms offstage, implied in Paul's use of sonship language, but only explicitly referenced in the cry Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (*abbā*, Father) in verse 15. The Son takes on a much greater role in the narrative in Romans 8, and in the υἱοθεσία metaphor in 8:15 in particular. Paul presents the sonship of the audience as integrally linked with the experience of the Son; the co-heirs are also co-sufferers and will be co-glorified. Thus the tension that the characterized audience experiences in verses 18–23 takes on a christological focus; their sufferings of this present time are colored by the sufferings of the Son in verse 17.

The role of the Spirit is the most prominent of the three members of the Trinity in Romans 8, and interestingly, undergoes the most transformation as the narrative progresses. In the opening of the narrative the characterization is rather flat and abstract, as the Spirit is described largely in antithetical terms to the "flesh." However, in verse 11 the Spirit begins to take a more active role, being identified both as the Spirit of the one who raised Jesus from the dead (τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν) and the Spirit who dwells in "you" (οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). The character of the Spirit is further developed through his involvement in the υἱοθεσία metaphor, where the Spirit enables the cry Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (*abbā*, Father) and co-testifies that the audience members are children of God (vv. 15–17). The narrative also attributes the inward groaning of the believers to the presence of the Spirit (v. 23), and even more poignantly, the Spirit helps and intercedes for the audience as they await the culmination of God's redemptive action (vv. 26–27).

164 Burke, "Adopted as Sons," 283.

Through the narrative framework and the various characters in Romans 8, Paul invites the audience members to participate in the story and identify with the experiences of its characters. Because the narrative utilizes an abundance of plural first and second person pronouns, the audience is undoubtedly led to identify most closely with Paul's characterization of them in the text. The minor characters of the narrative complement the story of the main character, bringing the experience of the characterized audience members into sharper relief. Thus the primary focus below will be to identify the emotions of the main character of the narrative (the audience) that are present within the diptych of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8, as these emotions were the ones most likely elicited by the text and experienced by Paul's flesh-and-blood audience members as the letter was read.

There are several instances of metaphors of emotion which crop up at various places in the narrative, such as the believers' cry *Αββα ὁ πατήρ* (*'abbā*, Father) invoking, "EMOTION IS A FLUID IN A CONTAINER,"¹⁶⁵ and the labor pains of creation and the groans of the believer combining the conceptual metaphors "EMOTION IS A PHYSICAL FORCE," with "INTERNAL IS EXTERNAL."¹⁶⁶ These instances of conceptual metaphors build upon three foundational conceptual metaphors that work together to elicit a particular emotional response from Paul's audience. Using Kövecses' categories, the contours of the emotions Paul presents in the context of the *υιοθεσία* diptych broadly correspond to emotions generally characterized as "UP" and those generally characterized as "DOWN." Presented side-by-side, these two conceptual metaphors create tension between the "upward" and "downward" emotion, which is then expressed by a third metaphor: "EMOTION IS A BURDEN." As the narrative progresses, the audience members also experience the tension in these various emotions, and are themselves burdened by the unresolved tension in the context of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors.

The presence of the "DOWN" emotions begins with the negative portrayal of the "flesh" in verses 12–13 and the accompanying image of slavery in verse 15, which is specifically labeled with the emotion "fear." Broadly, these images rely on the metaphor "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN."¹⁶⁷ More specifically, Paul's use of *ὀφειλέτης*, *θανατοῦν*, and *δουλεία* connotes various degrees of oppression or weight, which according to Kövecses also employs the metaphor "EMOTION IS A BURDEN."¹⁶⁸ According to Kövecses, "The external pressure caused by

165 Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 77.

166 *Ibid.*, 83–86.

167 *Ibid.*, 44.

168 *Ibid.*, 82–83.

the burden (Antagonist) on the body-container (Agonist) corresponds to the stress or difficulty caused by the emotion (Antagonist) on the self (Agonist).¹⁶⁹ In Romans 8:12–15, Paul's presentation of the flesh and its corresponding "EMOTION IS A BURDEN" acts as a foil to highlight the "unburdening" of the believers who receive the Spirit of adoption in verse 15. The "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN" images of flesh, slavery, and death are then contrasted with sonship (v. 15), where the result is glorification (v. 17). Here Paul's use of δοξάζειν implies an upward trajectory, and according to Kövecses' theory, "GOOD THINGS ARE UP."¹⁷⁰

However, it is also clear in the narrative that the audience is not yet fully experiencing their adoption, redemption, or glorification, and thus the "GOOD THINGS ARE UP" emotions are held in tension with the "BAD THINGS ARE DOWN." This is particularly apparent in Paul's juxtaposition in verse 18 between "suffering (πάθημα)," which is the present reality, and the "glory (δόξα)" which is on the brink of being revealed.¹⁷¹ The tension between these two emotional experiences manifests itself further in the context of the second υιοθεσία metaphor, where Paul's use of συστενάζειν and ἀπεκδέχεσθαι again speaks of these emotions as forces or burdens acting upon the audience, one implying a craning forward in eager expectation (ἀπεκδέχεσθαι),¹⁷² and one implying a weighing down (στενάζειν). Of στενάζειν Schneider writes, "Sighing takes place *by reason of a condition of oppression under which man suffers* and from which he longs to be free."¹⁷³ Thus the picture Paul sketches for his audience is one where they are straining forward for the final consummation of their adoption under the weight of the sufferings that are endemic to the present age.¹⁷⁴ As the audience is bombarded with these conflicting downward and upward emotions, they are invited to express the weight of this tension through groaning and sighing as they await its resolution.

169 Ibid., 82.

170 Ibid., 44.

171 Although δόξα is closely connected with the "weightiness" of God in the OT (e.g., Exod 19:16; 1 Sam 4:21–22), כבוד also can be used to refer to the exaltation of God "far above the sphere of natural phenomena" (TNDT, 2: 240), as in Psalm 19. Thus the idea of "weightiness" is still combined with an upward orientation in its conceptual framework.

172 TNDT, 2:56.

173 J. Schneider, "στενάζω, στεναγμός, συστενάζω," in TNDT, 7: 601 (emph. mine).

174 Michel Quesnel also expresses this tension well, "L'anticipation de la gloire est une conséquence de l'anticipation de la mort" ("La Figure de la Mort Dans L'Épître aux Romains: Fonction Rhétorique et Argumentative," in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 70.

As I have shown, the metaphors in Romans 8 invite the audience to experience the tension of conflicting emotional responses, which result in a profound sense of existential tension and displacement. Emerson Powery states, “Groans imply disorder. Praise implies awareness of God’s sovereignty. . . . These dimensions of prayer (i.e., the groan and the praise) are signs of the ‘hope’ and the ‘suffering’ of those in whom the Spirit of God dwells.”¹⁷⁵ Drawing on the “upward” conceptual metaphor, the feelings of hope and assurance are rooted in the believers’ awareness of their new status as adopted sons that will result in their coming glory. The assurance of the upward trajectory is further seen in the emotional response evoked by the *υιοθεσία* metaphor, where the believer cries out *Αββα ὁ πατήρ* (*‘abbā*, Father) in recognition of his or her transfer into the family of God.

However, alongside the believers’ emotional experience of “upward” looking concepts, such as hope and assurance of their identity as adopted sons of God, the believers also experience the “downward” emotions that come with the suffering and currently unfulfilled longing for complete redemption. As a result, the believers experience acute existential tension, which arises from the perception that they exist simultaneously *κατὰ πνεῦμα* (according to the Spirit) and also are suffering and groaning with all of creation as they await God’s final act of adoption. The believers’ groans are the inexorable consequence of their new identity as sons of God; this new identity propels them into a state of gnawing dissatisfaction with the status quo of the present age.¹⁷⁶ The vocabulary surrounding the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in 8:23 is laden with tension, angst, and longing. The future and upward orientation of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in verse 23 draws these emotions of groaning and longing to the surface for Paul’s audience, also making them acutely aware of the eschatological tension in which they have come to exist through their adoption to sonship. As Kraftchick aptly observes, “Paul believes in the coming resolution, but he resides in the present ambiguity.”¹⁷⁷ Thus, the emotional content evoked by the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 expresses the existential tension of the present ambiguity, and gives the believers a space to groan under an intense emotional burden for God’s final action, while they simultaneously rest in the assurance of their identity as sons of God.

175 Emerson Powery, “‘The Groans of ‘Brother Saul’: An Exploratory Reading of Romans 8 for ‘Survival,’” *WW* 24.3 (2004): 322 (emph. orig.).

176 Richard Dillon, “The Spirit as Taskmaster,” *CBQ* 60.4 (1998): 700.

177 Steven Kraftchick, “Paul’s Use of Creation Themes: A Test of Romans 1–8,” *ExAud* 3 (1987): 87.

Metaphor and Community

As a framework for structuring the perception of Paul's audience members, the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 are quite conducive to fostering intimacy and creating a sense of familial identity between their hearers. I have already discussed some of the possible effects the υιοθεσία metaphors might have had on the perception and emotion of their hearers, and in this section I will aim to illuminate the effect the metaphors' cognitive framework and emotional content might have had on how the members of Paul's community perceived their relationships to one another. I will also utilize the analysis from past sections to posit what sense of community identity Paul's audience might have derived from the metaphors. I will argue below that in Romans 8 Paul is able to create feelings of intimacy by overlaying a shared experience (the reception of the Spirit) with a framework of familial relationships (υιοθεσία). This creation of intimacy leads to the construction of a community identity by creating a "sameness of vision" among the hearers of the metaphor in regard to how they understand their relationships to God, to one another, and to outsiders.

Creation of Intimacy

Though the feelings of intimacy a metaphor creates need not necessarily be characterized by feelings of emotional closeness or caring,¹⁷⁸ this kind of intimacy is in view in Romans 8. This is particularly evident in the *'abbā* cry, where the believers' adoption to sonship affects the innermost part of their being.¹⁷⁹ In addition, the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 also achieve feelings of intimacy created by the "sameness of vision" that the metaphors engender when the audience members choose to participate in seeing their subject from a shared point of view with the author.¹⁸⁰ In Romans 8, this sameness of vision is the mutual recognition between members of the community that they see *X* through the same framework. In addition, while metaphors usually create intimacy between the author and audience and between audience members, it is difficult to distinguish clearly between these two cultivations in Romans 8. Paul switches freely between first person and second person plural forms throughout Romans 8, and frames the discussion through shared kinship terms like ἀδελφοί (siblings), υἱοί (sons), and τέκνα (children).

One of the most powerful creators of intimacy in the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 is that their sameness of vision directs the audience to view other

178 See chapter 3; see also William Horton, "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy," 89; Gaventa, *Our Mother St. Paul*, 12.

179 Moo, *Romans*, 504.

180 Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22–24.

members of the community as members of the same family of adopted sons. Although metaphorical designations of kinship did not necessarily imply a close relationship or a strong bond between designees,¹⁸¹ Paul's use of familial designations in Romans 8 draws attention to the "emotional intensity" of the chapter's content,¹⁸² and reminds the believers of their "common knowledge" which bolsters feelings of kinship and belonging, and emphasizes their distinctness as brothers and sisters who are different from outsiders.¹⁸³ The sameness of vision looks inward at other community members rather than at outsiders; it is self-reflective. The mutual recognition achieved by the metaphors is thus the mutual recognition of the shared status of sonship. The believers also share the mutual experience of crying out to Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ (ʾabbā, Father), which binds them together by creating a sameness of vision around their relationship to the Father.¹⁸⁴ Through this shared experience as adopted sons, believers of diverse ethnic origins, gender, and social status share in this intimate and emotional heart cry together, maximizing their interpersonal bonds and minimizing their perceived differences.

While it is not perhaps the dominant means through which intimacy is cultivated, the believers also share in the mutual recognition and sameness of vision of their state as adopted children caught between the "already" and "not yet" of the two ages.¹⁸⁵ The profound sense of temporal and existential displacement created by the tension between the two υἱοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8 cultivates a sense of intimacy between community members as they recognize their shared experience of suffering and existential unrest brought into existence through the Christ-event. This intimacy results not only from the shared experience itself,¹⁸⁶ but also from members of the group coming to the realization that they share this "sameness of vision." Thus the metaphor cultivates the bonds of intimacy by drawing upon the perception of temporal displacement and directing the attention of community members horizontally to recognize this as an experience held in common by all other members of the community.

181 See Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 18.

182 Ibid., 25–26.

183 Ibid., 26–27.

184 Jewett, *Romans*, 498.

185 Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 257.

186 This might be classified as a "joint activity" under Clark's understanding. Of joint activities, Clark remarks, "As individuals, we have an intuitive feeling for what we do and don't know, even when we cannot recall a piece of information at the moment. . . . [W]e also have an intuitive feeling about what others know, which we might call *feeling of others' knowing*, and it too is often very accurate" (*Using Language*, 111 [emph. orig.]).

Creation of Identity

In chapter three I argued that the metaphors of the New Testament were not only powerful tools for communicating theological content but that they also give voice to the shared experiences of members of the early Christian communities.¹⁸⁷ This is perhaps particularly true of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8, where adoption—an inherently relational metaphor—is set within a highly relational and community-oriented context (the communal experience of receiving the Spirit). There are a number of facets of identity formation that the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 potentially influenced including: the self-understanding of community members as participants in the new reality inaugurated in the Christ-event, the interpersonal relationships of community members relating as adopted members of the same family, and the solidarity with the groaning creation that is reinforced by linking their adoption to suffering and longing. In this context, the *υιοθεσία* metaphors provide a structure through which the community can process its interpersonal relationships with one another, its relationship to those who remain outside of the community boundaries, and, to some extent, even its place in time and history.

Above I argued that the *υιοθεσία* metaphors provide a cognitive framework which provides a structure for the shared experience of the reception of the Spirit. This reception of the Spirit unites the community members to Christ and to one another as “people who are led by the Spirit.” Moreover, Paul’s inclusion of the flesh/Spirit dichotomy also forms a barrier around the community members by distinguishing them from outsiders who are “in the flesh.”¹⁸⁸ Through the framework of *υιοθεσία*, the believers connect their experience of the Spirit with entrance into the community of believers, the community of those who belong to Christ (8:9). Furthermore, Paul solidifies not only the existence of this new mode of being (in the Spirit), but also undergirds the sense of community identity by enlisting the audience as active participants in their new family. Tonstad writes, “[T]he recipients of the letter are enlisted as codeclarers and coannouncers of the new reality.”¹⁸⁹ They testify alongside the Spirit that they God’s children (8:16), and proclaim alongside Christ that God is their Father (8:15). By drawing the audience members into the text and encouraging them to actively participate in declaring their adoption, Paul is able to further solidify the self-understanding of the community members as the adopted children of God.

187 See chapter 3.

188 See also Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 488; Schreiner, *Romans*, 410–14.

189 Tonstad, “Revisionary Potential,” 6.

The *υιοθεσία* metaphors create and communicate a paradigm of kinship for the interpersonal relatedness between community members. Moreover, unlike, for example, new birth metaphors, the *υιοθεσία* metaphors create kinship bonds that supersede, but do not eliminate, ethnic distinctions.¹⁹⁰ The underlying model of *υιοθεσία* evokes associations of an adult son being transferred from one family to another. Although these sons assume a new *paterfamilias* and a new family identity, the process of adoption does not imply an ontological transformation of essence in the same way as does a metaphor of new birth. Rather, *υιοθεσία* as a framework implies the continuity of personhood and identity for individuals when they are transferred into the new *familia*. Thus, the framework of *υιοθεσία* is particularly well suited to creating a unifying identity for the diverse members of Paul's audience, while also affirming the presence of diversity. At least in the context of Romans, Paul's version of salvation does not entail ethnic or cultural extinction, but rather Paul's choice of metaphors preserves features of ethnic and social identity, all the while urging for mutual acceptance between community members.¹⁹¹ Thus the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 function as a fixed symbol of community identity, marking out the members of the community as members of the same adoptive family, but yet the image is fluid and inclusive enough to affirm the ongoing differences between community members.

In Romans 8, the believers' separation from the world is held in tension with their suffering and solidarity with it. This dialectic created by the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors is another powerful force for the construction of the identity and self-understanding of Paul's audience. The close identification of *υιοθεσία* with the suffering of believers both as co-sufferers with Christ and as those who groan in solidarity with creation results in the construction of a community whose identity is grounded in empathic suffering. As Gaventa remarks, "There is here a unity of everything in its createdness and in its relationship to God."¹⁹² Moreover, while the believers understand their adoption in the context of suffering, the metaphor also lends itself well to viewing those outside the community as other potential adopted brothers and sisters. The metaphor frames adoption as something God extends to his sons through the reception of the Spirit, and thus the community boundary retains at least some level of fluidity so that new brothers and sisters can be included.¹⁹³

190 See also Beker, "The Faithfulness of God," 10–16.

191 Robert Jewett, "The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans," *Int* 39.4 (1985): 354.

192 Gaventa, "Neither Height nor Depth," 277.

193 See also *ibid.*, 267.

Connecting adoption to the believers' experience of suffering and to their communal groaning for God's eschatological action also forges a sense of community identity around the experience of temporal displacement among community members. Here especially the performative nature of a metaphorical utterance is essential to the construction of this boundary,¹⁹⁴ as tension between the two metaphors creates and intensifies the profound feeling of existential tension resulting from Paul's paradoxical "already-but-not-yet" temporal framework.¹⁹⁵ Indeed, it is hard to imagine an element that would be more useful in constructing a sense of community identity than to create the impression that community members belong to a separate age than their surrounding culture. In Romans 8 Paul succeeds in creating a sameness of vision among his audience for how they perceive something as fundamental as time. Bound together as a community of adopted sons, the believers' identity is closely tied to their shared sense of temporal displacement, of which they were made aware by the reception of the Spirit.

Conclusion

The two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 are part of a complex and multifaceted description of the believers' relationship to the Triune God and to one another. The imagery is so evocative that it leads Moo to conclude, "Paul's description of the Spirit's work in conferring sonship forms one of the most beautiful pictures of the believer's joy and security anywhere in Scripture."¹⁹⁶ In terms of its textual features, I identified that 8:15 and 8:23 are two distinct metaphorical utterances, but argued that they each comprise part of a diptych in the frame that stretches from 8:12–25. Using Soskice's definition,¹⁹⁷ I argued that the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in verse 15 should be rendered, "speaking about the initiation of God's relationship with the believer and his or her entrance into the community of believers in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." Under this construal, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor speaks not only to soteriology, but also has a profound effect on how the believers understand their

194 See chapter 3; see also Asano, *Community-Identity Construction*, 39; Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 388.

195 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 1, 487–91.

196 Moo, *Romans*, 499.

197 "That figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another" (Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15).

relationships to one another (ecclesiology). Likewise using Soskice's framework, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in verse 23 would read, "speaking about God's eschatological action toward believers (and the believers' anticipation of those actions) in terms which are seen to be suggestive of adoption." When combined, the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors tie together the complex dialectics between slavery and sonship, and between suffering and hope, with adoption to sonship forming an emphatic and resonant focal point for the entire passage.

Moving beyond the confines of the text, I also argued that, as in Galatians 4:5, the two metaphors closely link *υιοθεσία* to the believers' experience of receiving the Spirit, providing a familial cognitive framework through which the believer understands his or her new existence in the Spirit. However, unlike in Galatians 4:1–7, the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 draw attention to the acute existential and eschatological tension that has accompanied the audience's experience of the Spirit. Furthermore, drawn from the complex themes in the text, the cognitive framework constructed by the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 is likewise complex, containing vertical, horizontal, and temporal dimensions. In a similar fashion to the role of each member of the Trinity in Galatians 4:5, the framework of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 creates the perception of the Father as the initiator of adoption, the Spirit as the witness, and the Son as their elder brother and co-heir. Thus the framework created by *υιοθεσία* highlights the involvement of the whole Trinity in bringing the believer into the intimate relationship of sonship.

I also showed that the cognitive framework created by the two *υιοθεσία* metaphors draws attention to the horizontal relationships between community members, perhaps minimizing the importance of ethnic or social distinctions between them. Whereas the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 rooted the community identity in the sonship of believers in Christ and in faith rather than in Abraham and law observance, the metaphors in Romans 8 highlight the common bonds of community members as brothers and sisters who are co-sufferers in this present age. In Romans 8, the believers as members of one family are joined together as co-heirs, co-sufferers, and co-participants in glorification with Christ, and I argued that their solidarity with Christ likely also produced feelings of solidarity toward one another as brothers and sisters. Moreover, I contended that the temporal dimensions of the cognitive structure in Romans 8 created the perception of acute displacement for the believers, which likely contributed significantly to the cultivation of intimacy between community members by highlighting their shared existence as people "caught between" the tension of the two ages. This sameness of vision is seen most clearly in the communal groaning of the believers as they await God's final

eschatological restoration. Because the two *υἱοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8 draw on the experience of the believers and provide a familial framework through which to interpret their life as part of the community, they must be recognized as powerful agents in forming and reforming the perceptions, emotions, and identity of the Christians in Rome.

To Whom Belongs the Adoption: The υιοθεσία Metaphor in Romans 9:4

Introduction

It is most certainly beyond the scope of this study to give a comprehensive argument for the place Paul imagines for Israel in Romans 9–11.¹ Rather, here I must restrict myself to an examination of the literary construction and the cognitive and affective potential of υιοθεσία as it appears in its context as one of the privileges Paul designates as belonging to the Israelites (Romans 9:4). However, an interpreter's understanding of "Israel" in Romans 9–11 often informs and, to some degree, determines his or her exegetical conclusions. As Wolfgang Reinbold argues, one of the chief interpretive difficulties faced in Romans 9–11 is determining to whom Paul is referring when he says "Israel."² Therefore, a few words of clarification are warranted. First, I take Romans 9–11 to be an integral component to Paul's argument,³ not an unrelated excursus or tangent.⁴ Second, I will take seriously the ethnic component of οἱ τινὲς εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται (such ones are Israelites) and treat Romans 9:1–5 as the list of historic privileges God has bestowed upon the nation of Israel as an ethnic,

-
- 1 For a good survey of the history of interpretive approaches to Romans 9–11 see Klaus Haacker, "Das Thema von Römer 9–11 als Problem der Auslegungsgeschichte," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 55–72; Mark Reasoner, "Romans 9–11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 73–89; J. N. Aletti, *Israël et la loi dans la lettre aux romains* (Paris: Cerf, 1998).
 - 2 Wolfgang Reinbold, "Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Israel' in Römer 9–11," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 401; see also Michael Wolter, "Das Israelprobleme nach Gal 4,21–31 und Röm 9–11," *ZTK* 107 (2010): 1–30.
 - 3 For a good defense of the thematic integration of Romans 9–11 with Romans 1–8 and 12–16 see Cristoph Stenschke, "Römer 9–11 als Teil des Römerbriefs," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 197–225.
 - 4 So e.g., C. H. Dodd who claims "the epistle without any sense of gap if these chapters were omitted" (*The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* [MNTC, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932], 149.

political, and religious entity.⁵ Moreover, as Gaventa observes, to ask about Israel as an ethnic, political, and religious entity is axiomatically to ask about the covenant relationship between YHWH and Israel, since, as Gaventa observes, “Paul writes nothing about an Israel that can be isolated as an ethnic entity or a ‘nation,’ but only as God’s creation in each patriarchal generation.”⁶ Furthermore, I take Paul’s words in verses 1–3 to be a lament over his kinsfolk’s failure to recognize Jesus as the Messiah of Israel, and that Paul’s desire to be “anathema” from Christ implies that he believes this to be the status of many of his kinsfolk.⁷

The question Paul answers in Romans 9–11 is not to do with Israel and the Church as has at times been supposed, but rather Paul’s question pertains solely to Israel and the faithfulness of God to his promises.⁸ Dunn aptly says, “[T]he sole entity in view is Israel itself, the definition of Israel and membership of Israel, who and how the branches of the olive tree of Israel (11:17–24) are constituted.”⁹ In light of these considerations, my primary task here is to explore how Paul uses and interprets these historic privileges of Israel, and

-
- 5 See Susan Grove Eastman for an excellent analysis of Paul’s use of “Israelite” as a designation for ethnic Jews (“Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9–11,” *NTS* 56 [2010]: 367–95); see also Reinbold, “Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes ‘Israel,’” 408–409; for a reflection on the historical ramifications of Paul’s assertions regarding Israel in Romans 9:1–5 see Heinz Kremers, “Das jüdische Volk ist noch immer ‘Israel’—Volk Gottes: Eine Auslegung von Röm 9,1–5,” in *Mission an Israel in heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht*, eds. Heinz Kremers, and Erich Lubahn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 37–48.
 - 6 Beverly Roberts Gaventa, “On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6–29,” in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 257 (emph. orig.).
 - 7 Pace Stowers who sees the list of privileges as further confirmation that Romans was written to an exclusively gentile audience, and that “Jews still possess the kind of relation to God which 1:20–32 says that the gentiles have lost” (*A Rereading of Romans*, 129; see also 129–34). Hodge’s analysis of Romans 9–11 is based on a similar argument. She states, “The content of the good news is the same for the Jews and Greeks, but what it means for each group differs. . . . The relevance of this good news for the *Ioudaioi*, who already have these things that the gentiles have recently gained, is that it signals arrival of the awaited time. Through Christ, the nations are coming to Israel” (*If Sons, Then Heirs*, 139).
 - 8 See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 517–21 for an excellent explanation of Paul’s argument in Romans 9–11. See also Bruce W. Longenecker, “Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9–11,” *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95–123.
 - 9 James D. G. Dunn, “Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?: Reflections of Romans 9:4 and 11:27,” in *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*, ed. Sheila E. McGinn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 16.

υιοθεσία specifically, in his own wrestling with the question of God's faithfulness to his covenant with his chosen people.

Metaphor and Text

The Metaphorical Utterance in Romans 9:4

Unlike the metaphorical utterance in Romans 8:15 where Paul fleshes out and develops the metaphor in considerable detail, the metaphorical utterance containing υιοθεσία in Romans 9 exists as a predication without explanation, and as one among many others in a list of privileges belonging to the Israelites. Indeed the argument could be made that since Paul does not elaborate upon υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4, it is a rather minor component in his summary of Israel's ongoing relationship with YHWH. Furthermore, υιοθεσία might have been chosen for purely stylistic reasons, in order to maintain the assonance between the—ία endings of the other privileges Paul lists.¹⁰ However, since Paul has used υιοθεσία twice in prominent places in the preceding passage, the concept "adoption to sonship" is already fixed in his audience's mind when he mentions it again in 9:4, which suggests that it had the potential to make a significant contribution to shaping the audience's perception of Israel.

Recall from the second chapter that metaphorical meaning is determined at the level of an utterance rather than a lexeme. Therefore the significantly different content of the phrase in which υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 appears will have a significant impact on the meaning of the metaphorical utterance. While the metaphor's vehicle remains the same (υιοθεσία), in Romans 9:4 the metaphor's tenor has shifted from the believers' relationship to God in Romans 8:15 and 8:23 to the Israelites' relationship to God. Since we must consider the interanimation of the tenor and vehicle in determining the meaning of the metaphorical utterance, we should anticipate that a change in the metaphor's tenor will produce a different set of implications than the metaphorical utterances in Romans 8 where a different tenor is present. Furthermore, the metaphor in

10 The presence of atypical terms in this list has led some to conclude that Paul has appropriated a traditional list from a Hellenistic Jewish source (see Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 4th ed. [KEK, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966], 228; Calvin Roetzel, "Διαθήκαι in Romans 9:4," *Bib* 51 [1970]: 388). However, Pauline authorship is to be preferred since parallel lists of privileges are lacking in other Jewish literature (see John Piper, *The Future of Justification* [Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007], 6–7; Schreiner, *Romans*, 483). For a good explanation of Paul's form and style in 9:4 see Folker Siegert, *Argumentation bei Paulus: gezeigt an Röm 9–11* (WUNT 34, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 122.

Romans 9:4 picks out a different referent (Israelites), and this too potentially changes the implications of the metaphor. In light of these considerations, we first must identify the metaphorical utterance in order to explain the interanimation of its tenor and vehicle.¹¹

In Romans 9:4 the metaphor consists of the phrase, “They are Israelites, to whom [belongs] the adoption” (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία). The metaphor occurs in the midst of a larger list of privileges (the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, the promises, the patriarchs, and the Messiah according to ethnicity).¹² This list, in turn, belongs to the larger block of text, Romans 9:1–5. In the preceding verses we find that Paul is in agony over the state of his kinsfolk according to the flesh, the Israelites. It is also widely recognized that these verses serve as an introduction to Paul’s thesis statement in verse 6, “It is not as though the word of God had failed” (Οὐχ οἶον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ), which he then qualifies with the assertion “for not all [who descended] from Israel are Israel” (οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ).¹³ Regarding verse 6b, the sense of the text is not that Paul envisions an Israel within Israel, but rather that the “Israel” Paul envisions was brought into being and is sustained through YHWH’s elective covenant relationship rather than through natural lineage or biology. Thus “Israel” for Paul is a theological designation.¹⁴ Moreover, although verse 6 functions as the thesis statement of the passage, it cannot be separated from the list of privileges in verses 4–5 which remind the audience of God’s actions in Israel’s history. Paul’s preamble in verses 1–5 thus serves as a framework that introduces Paul’s thesis in verse 6, and provides the foundation for the whole of chapters 9–11.¹⁵

11 For a fuller explanation of the interanimation theory of metaphor see chapter 2; see also Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 43–53.

12 οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι, ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα (Rom 9:4).

13 E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 518; Brian J. Abasciano, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis* (LNTS 301, London: T & T Clark, 2005), 180. For a detailed argument for the possibility of 9:6 being inclusive of all Israel see Michael Cranford, “Election and Ethnicity: Paul’s View of Israel in Romans 9:1–13,” *JSNNT* 50 (1993): 27–41; for an alternative view see Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, “Nicht alle aus Israel sind Israel’ (Röm 9,6b): Römer 9–11 als Zeugnis paulinischer Anthropologie,” in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilks, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 433–62.

14 Gaventa, “On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel,” 259.

15 I will explore this possibility in greater detail below.

Interestingly, of the list of privileges Paul gives here, υιοθεσία is the only metaphorical predication among them.¹⁶ Recall from the first chapter that I am defining a metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another.”¹⁷ Here then, we have Israel’s relationship with God spoken about in terms seen to be suggestive of υιοθεσία. Though the other privileges in the list are non-metaphorical, this utterance should be taken as metaphorical for several reasons. First, as a description, υιοθεσία does not exhaust the complexities of God’s covenant relationship with Israel, which we would expect if υιοθεσία were a non-metaphorical term used to refer to the covenant relationship.¹⁸ However, what we see both in the Old Testament and here in Paul’s argument are multiple descriptions of the relationship between God and the Israelites. For example, in the Old Testament Israel is described not only as the firstborn son of YHWH (e.g., Exod 4:22),¹⁹ but also in terms seen to be suggestive of a wife (Hos 2:2–3), a whore (Hos 2:4–5), as sheep of a shepherd (Ezek 34:11–16), and many others. Moreover, in the course of Romans 9–11, Paul speaks of Israel as clay in the potter’s hand (9:20–22), dough (11:16), and branches of an olive tree (11:17–24).

Both the Pauline and Old Testament metaphors utilize a particular vehicle (son, wife, whore, branches, etc.), to speak of Israel’s covenant relationship in terms which are seen to be suggestive of this vehicle. Where some vehicles lend themselves more easily to the recognition of the presence of a metaphor (perhaps “branches,” “sheep,” and “clay”), it seems that when vehicles that can also refer to humans or human relationships are used there is more reluctance to label the utterance as “metaphorical.” Perhaps, then, in order to demonstrate

16 Paul’s reference to “the glory” (ἡ δόξα) is the only other possible exception, in which case Paul would be speaking of God’s presence in terms which are seen to be suggestive of glory. However, it is arguable that this metaphor has become so common (e.g., Exod 16:7–10; 24:16–17; Lev 9:6; Num 14:10; 16:19; Deut 5:24; 1 Sam 4:21–22; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chr 5:14; 7:1–3; Ps 97:6; 102:15–16; Isa 4:5; 6:3; 40:5; 60:1; Ezek 1:28; 3:12, 23; 8:4; 9:3; 10:4–19; 11:22–23; 43:2–5; Hab 3:3; Sir 49:8; Bar 5:6–9; 2 Macc 2:8) that it should be classified as a “dead” metaphor. For further discussion on living and dead metaphors see chapter 2.

17 Soksice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15. For a full explanation of the merits of Soksice’s definition, see chapter 2.

18 The unique intertextual issue raised by Paul’s peculiar use of υιοθεσία, which occurs nowhere in the LXX, will be discussed in more detail below.

19 This is not to say that the “sonship” metaphors of the Old Testament and intertestamental literature are the same metaphor that Paul is using here. The intertextual relationship between Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphors and the sonship metaphor tradition is not nearly as straightforward as has often been assumed by scholars; *pace* Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 81–84; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 148–49.

that these utterances *must* be metaphorical we need only note that Israel cannot both be “son” and “wife” to YHWH. Indeed, properly speaking a nation lacks the capacity to be either, since it is not a person. However, as metaphors these two utterances each describe the covenant relationship with YHWH in ways that the other lacks, and neither metaphor provides us with a complete picture of Israel’s covenant relationship with YHWH. What we should conclude from these diverse descriptions in Scripture is that, as McFague notes, “*Many metaphors and models are necessary, that a piling up of images is essential . . . to attempt to express the richness and variety of the divine-human relationship.*”²⁰ The many and varied descriptions of the covenant relationship each produce a slightly different cognitive structure and affective result for the audience, and they are not interchangeable.²¹ Furthermore, if υἱοθεσία here is a description of the covenant relationship, then we must recognize also that this description is *Paul’s own description* of the multifaceted covenant relationship, and that Paul had other descriptions available (e.g., “firstborn son” ὁ πρωτότοκος or perhaps even “the election” ἡ ἐκλογή).²² Indeed, other descriptions at Paul’s disposal were more well-worn and familiar to both him and his audience, making his choice of υἱοθεσία all the more striking.

Furthermore, the rest of the terms in Paul’s list of privileges directly refer to either a historical event or a concrete object. Unlike υἱοθεσία, which makes a reference to God’s covenant relationship with Israel by speaking of it in terms which are seen to be suggestive of something else—i.e., adoption—each of the other privileges speaks of its subject directly. We can connect “the glory” (ἡ δόξα) to the glory of God’s presence that appeared to the Israelites several times during the exodus events (e.g., Exod 16:10; 24:15–17) and then resided in the tabernacle (Exod 29:43; 40:34–35; Lev 9:23; Num 14:10) and then in the temple (2 Chr 5:14; 7:1). The plural covenants (αἱ διαθήκαι) might refer to all of the various covenants between YHWH and Israel in the Old Testament (e.g., the covenants with Abraham: Gen 15, 17; with Moses: Exod 19:5–6; with David: 2 Sam 23:5), or it might point to the trajectory of the single Abrahamic covenant. The giving of the law (ἡ νομοθεσία) is certainly a reference to the

20 McFague, *Metaphorical Theology*, 20 (emph. orig.).

21 I will argue in greater detail that Israel’s covenant relationship with YHWH is the most likely candidate for the tenor of the metaphor in the following section.

22 Paul may have chosen υἱοθεσία rather than πρωτότοκος purely for stylistic reasons, but one cannot help think that if he had wanted to maintain Israel’s traditional designation as “firstborn son” he might have chosen to phrase things differently. The “election” at least is feminine, though use of the plural to create the desired assonance with the other terms admittedly would make little sense.

Mosaic law, though whether νομοθεσία is taken actively to mean “the giving of the law on Mt. Sinai,” or passively to mean their possession of the collection of “God-given” law perhaps attempts too fine a distinction where one is unwarranted.²³ Paul’s reference to “the worship” (ἡ λατρεία) likely refers to the cultic observance and the sacrificial system (e.g., Exod 12:25–26; Josh 21:27 LXX; 1 Chr 28:13). Like the covenants, the reference to “the promises” (αἱ επαγγελίαι) recalls Paul’s earlier mentions of YHWH’s promises to Abraham regarding his inheritance (land) and offspring (Gen 12:2–9; 15:5–7; 17:4–8; Rom 4:1, 13, 16–17). The final parallel term in the list, “the patriarchs” (οἱ πατέρες), again recalls Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to whom YHWH promises covenant blessing for them and their descendants. The last privilege Paul mentions in a separate clause is the ethnic descent of the Messiah, who is “from them according to the flesh” (ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα).²⁴

Each of these privileges refers directly to a particular historical act of YHWH (e.g., the giving of the law, the covenants, and the promises), an activity the Israelites perform (e.g., the worship), or particular people or things (e.g., the glory of God, the patriarchs, and the lineage of the Messiah). In most cases there is a word to word, or at least a concept to concept (e.g., Paul’s νομοθεσία and νόμος) correspondence between Paul’s privilege and the event/action/or person to which it refers. By contrast, υἰοθεσία does not directly refer to any obvious event in Israel’s history, nor does it pick out a concrete object or activity. This ostensibly suggests that in Romans 9:4 Paul means the term as a qualitative description of Israel’s ongoing relationship with YHWH rather than a quantifiable bestowing of the privilege at a particular moment in Israel’s history. However, this claim must be considered in more detail, and I will do so below in the discussion surrounding the metaphor’s tenor, which is closely related to the referent of the metaphor. The lack of a direct referent for υἰοθεσία leads to the tentative conclusion that, unlike the other privileges in Romans 9:4, υἰοθεσία is a qualitative and metaphorical description of YHWH’s ongoing covenant relationship with Israel. Thus the metaphorical utterance we are dealing with is οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία (such ones are Israelites, to whom

23 For the former view see Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 463, Eldon Epp, “Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1–5),” *HTR* 79 (1986): 89; and *TDNT*, 4:1089; for the latter view see Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 546 and Byrne, *Romans*, 287. Fitzmyer and Byrne cite 2 Macc 6:23; 4 Macc 5:35; 17:16 as examples of νομοθεσία as the result rather than the act of law-giving.

24 On the significance of Christ in Romans 9:5 in particular see Hans-Christian Kammler, “Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als ‘Gott’ und die paulinische Christologie: Erwägungen zur Exegese von Röm 9,5b,” *ZNW* 94.3–4 (2003): 164–80.

belongs the υιοθεσία), in which Paul is speaking of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υιοθεσία. This conclusion will become firmer as we proceed through the analysis of the metaphor's tenor and vehicle below, which will discuss the referent of the metaphor in Romans 9:4 with more detail and clarity.

Tenor and Vehicle

In this identified metaphor (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ υιοθεσία/such ones are Israelites, to whom belongs the υιοθεσία), the vehicle is ostensibly υιοθεσία.²⁵ Paul is speaking about the tenor in terms which are seen to be suggestive of υιοθεσία, which means that Paul is speaking about *something* (i.e., the tenor) using the framework of υιοθεσία (i.e., the vehicle). This seems relatively straightforward, except that, as I described earlier, υιοθεσία might have evoked more than one model simultaneously (e.g., Roman adoption *and* the Jewish sonship tradition). So it is possible then, that various readers could have construed the vehicle as a framework of Roman adoption, as the Jewish sonship tradition, or more likely, both ideas together as mutually interpreting one another. Thus the vehicle here is not merely υιοθεσία, as a single word, but the whole set of associations evoked by the word *and* its literary and historical-cultural background.²⁶ Given that the metaphor occurs within the context of a list of Israel's privileges, it is particularly likely here that both the Jewish sonship tradition and the Roman understanding of adoption hang together in a delicate balance to form the metaphor's vehicle.

The tenor of the metaphor has several potential candidates to consider: (1) YHWH's ratification of the covenant and "adoption" of Israel at Mt. Sinai, (2) the "adoption" of the Davidide that is referred to in 2 Samuel 7:14 and Psalm 2:7,²⁷ or (3) Israel's ongoing covenant relationship with YHWH. Because

25 Recall again from the first chapter that I will speak of a metaphor as having both a "tenor," which is "the subject upon which it is hoped light will be shed," and a vehicle, which is "the subject to which allusion is made in order to shed that light" (Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 27). Recall also that the tenor of the metaphor need not be explicitly mentioned in the text, but rather is evoked and implied by the vehicle (for a more complete explanation see chapter 2). In Soskice's definition, the first half pertains to the tenor (*speaking of one thing*) and the second refers to the vehicle (*in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another*) (Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 15).

26 The possible backgrounds for the underlying model(s) of υιοθεσία were discussed in detail in chapter 4.

27 Scott sees these two Old Testament references as the "unified and specific Old Testament/Jewish background of 'adoption as sons' (υιοθεσία) in the Corpus Paulinum" (*Adoption as Sons*, 269 [emph. orig.]).

metaphors extend an invitation to the audience to participate in the construction of their meaning, it is impossible to entirely rule out any one option for consideration, but I will argue that the context in Romans 9:4 strongly favors the third option over the first two (or others).

The first option must be considered because of its popularity among scholars who seek to link Israel's adoption with a particular historical occurrence, which most claim is the ratification of the covenant at Sinai where υιοθεσία is connected to the giving of the law (Exod 19:16–20; 20:1–21). First, it is possible for metaphorical utterances to pick out historical events. For example, “the fall of the iron curtain” is a metaphorical description that picks out the end of the Cold War. So then, scholars who argue this position claim that Paul's privilege of υιοθεσία refers to a particular event in Israel's history. Abasciano expresses this view well when he claims that Israel's “adoption was uniquely established through the ratification of the covenant on Sinai.”²⁸ Schreiner argues that υιοθεσία is connected to νομοθεσία stating that “both . . . hark back to the exodus events when Israel was redeemed as God's son . . . and the covenant was ratified through the giving of the law.”²⁹ Similarly, Dunn describes Paul's use of υιοθεσία as “evoking the folk memory of that initial great act of redemption whereby God took the children of Israel as his own,”³⁰ and Schlier argues, “Dabei ist υιοθεσία die Sohnschaft, die durch Adoption zustande kommt,”³¹ both also citing Exodus 4:22.

However, connecting Israel's adoption to the exodus events is unsatisfying for several reasons. First, there is no Old Testament occurrence where Israel *becomes* the son of YHWH, rather Israel's designation as *son* is assumed and used as the basis for YHWH's actions toward Israel or on Israel's behalf, or for Israel's need to behave in a particular way (e.g., Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1–2; Mal 1:6). The text in Exodus cited by scholars who hold this position does not seem to imply that YHWH's command to Moses *makes* Israel the son of YHWH at this moment, but rather the command to Pharaoh is based on the assumption that Israel *is* the son of YHWH already. This is not an installation of Israel to sonship, but rather an affirmation of Israel's current status as the son of YHWH. Moreover, though Abasciano and Schreiner point to Exodus 4:22 as the “adoption,” they also want to connect Israel's adoption with the giving of the law, which happens much later in Exodus, after Israel—YHWH's son—has been

28 Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 124.

29 Schreiner, *Romans*, 483; see also *TDNT*, 8:359–60.

30 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 533; see also Barrett, *Romans*, 177; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), vol. 2, 5.

31 Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 286.

delivered from Egypt. Furthermore, when the law is given at Sinai there is no mention of Israel's sonship (see esp. Exod 19–24; 32–34 where one might have expected sonship to be ratified) so it seems tendentious to conclude that Paul is connecting the status of sonship with the giving of the law based solely on its use much earlier in Exodus 4:22.

I would suggest that if there were such a moment to pick out as the tenor of the metaphor, for Paul it would seem more natural for it to rest with YHWH's establishment of the covenant with Abraham (Gen 12:1–2; 17:1–14), the foundation of Israel as the recipients of God's promises. Käsemann alludes to this moment as the ratification of Israel's adoption when he states, "The relationship of the Christian world to *Abraham* is now extended to all Israel."³² Moreover, Paul himself seems quite concerned with tracing the lineage of true Israel to Abraham and the promise rather than to Moses and the law (Rom 4:1–25; Gal 3:6–29). The Pauline references to Abraham are littered with the same vocabulary of "sons," (Gal 3:26) "seed," (Romans 4:13, 16, 18; Gal 3:16, 19, 29) "heir," (Romans 4:14; Gal 3:29) "inheritance," (Romans 4:13; Gal 3:18) and "promise" (Gal 3:14, 17–19, 21–22, 29) that we find in the Pauline adoption passages, making it unlikely that Paul now abruptly would connect Israel's sonship to Moses and the giving of the law rather than to Abraham and the giving of the promise.³³ However, the text in Genesis never refers to Abraham or his descendants as sons of YHWH. Instead, the first time a sonship metaphor occurs refers to Israel as a collective, which is in God's command to Moses, "Then you shall say to Pharaoh . . . Israel is my firstborn son" in Exodus 4:22–23. This text speaks of Israel's sonship as an established relationship, indeed an established relationship directly parallel to Pharaoh's relationship with his firstborn son.

Regarding the second option, while it is possible that the audience would have reduced the reference to Israel's collective adoption to the expectation of individual sonship of the messianic Davidic king, there is little within the context to nudge the audience members in that direction. Certainly it is possible, as Scott argues, that the Davidic king was so central a figure in Israel's history that references to Israel's collective sonship in the developing tradition were always evocative of the individual sonship of the messianic Davidide.³⁴ In defense of this point, Scott asserts that

32 Käsemann, *Romans*, 258 (emph. mine); see also Schlatter who traces Israel's privileges back to Abraham rather than to Moses and the giving of the law (*Römer*, 171).

33 This is particularly true in Galatians 3:26–29, where Paul connects the "sons of God through faith in Christ" (υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) with the "seed of Abraham" (εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ).

34 See Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96–117.

whereas 2 Sam. 7 subsumed the Davidic promise under the covenant with Israel, the subsequent Jewish tradition based on 2 Sam 7:14 oriented the renewal of the covenant relationship, including Israel's divine sonship (cf. Hos 2:1), to the messianically-interpreted Davidic promise. . . . Hence the national expectation of divine adoption, converging as it does with the messianic expectation, leads to an appropriation of 2 Sam 7:14a to the eschatological people of God as a whole, a sort of national identification with the sonship of the *Heilbringer*.³⁵

However, in his exegesis of Romans 9:4 Scott fails to address the fact that in Romans 9:4–5 Paul mentions both the adoption of Israel *and* the ethnic descent of the messiah (Scott's Davidide). If one is wrapped up in the other, as Scott claims, then why is it necessary for Paul to mention both the adoption of Israel and the lineage of the Davidide? It seems that for Paul, the adoption of Israel is a separate privilege from the ethnic descent of the messiah rather than it "converging . . . with the messianic expectation."³⁶ Furthermore, Scott fails to address the trajectory of Paul's list of privileges, which culminates in privileging Israel collectively, as an ethnic group, as the kinsmen and the source of the *individual* messiah, rather than the divine adoption of the Davidide being applied to the collective nation of Israel.³⁷ Furthermore, Paul's list of privileges follows the same trajectory as the Old Testament, in which the Davidide is named the firstborn son of YHWH because he is the preeminent representative of Israel's collective sonship mentioned much earlier in Exodus 4:22.³⁸ Likewise, Paul's list of privileges in Romans 9:4–5 moves from the collective sonship of Israel to the individual Messiah, the preeminent representative of the Israelites, which makes it unlikely that υιοθεσία, near the beginning of the list, evokes the Davidide's sonship rather than the collective sonship of Israel.

Though it is not possible to completely rule out the first two possibilities for all of Paul's audience members, the most likely candidate for the tenor of the metaphor is Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH.³⁹ Above I argued that

35 Ibid., 117.

36 Ibid.

37 Kammler, "Die Prädikation," 169.

38 Indeed, this could be said of Scott's argument as a whole, which consistently views the individual Davidide as the source for the collective understanding of sonship. It seems to me that this is precisely backward from the trajectory of collective to individual that we find in the Old Testament texts.

39 So Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 545; Byrne, "Sons of God," 81; Klaus Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THKNT 6, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006), 208; Munck, *Christ and Israel*, 27–34.

it is unlikely that Paul's designation here picks out any historical act where YHWH designates Israel as his son, and that the descriptions "firstborn" or "son" are not exhaustive as a portrayal of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH. However, given the close affinity of the concept "adoption" and the concept of Israel's "sonship" found in the sonship tradition, it is likely that Paul's use of υἱοθεσία here *both evokes and interprets* the Old Testament description of Israel as the son, or the firstborn son, of YHWH, which most often occurs in connection with YHWH's covenant relationship with Israel (e.g., Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1; Mal 3:16–17; Isa 1:2; 63:8; Jer 31:9; Hos 2:1 (1:10)).⁴⁰

Furthermore, since Paul's inclusion of υἱοθεσία in the list of privileges of Israel in Romans 9:4 occurs after its use in Romans 8 as a metaphorical description of the believers' relationship to the Father, Son, and Spirit, it is likely that the audience would see Israel's adoption as analogous, at least in some ways, to the adoption of believers in the previous passage.⁴¹ Perhaps then, in the same way that the Spirit of adoption testifies to the believers' relationship with Christ in the new covenant, υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 resonates as an apt description of God's ongoing covenant relationship with Israel. Although some scholars argue that Paul is emphasizing the differences between Israel's "preparatory" adoption and the "full adoption" of believers in Romans 8,⁴² it is just as likely that Paul uses υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 to highlight the similarities of God's past actions toward Israel and God's present actions towards believers in Christ. Moreover, though it is highly unlikely that Paul's audience heard the same set of implications with each use of Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor, because Paul's metaphor in 9:4 evokes two models (Roman adoption and Israelite sonship), it is likely that these models produce an expanded set of implications rather than implying a more restricted form of adoption than what Paul intends for believers in Romans 8. Rather, it seems more reasonable to conclude that the metaphor in Romans 9:4 built upon the previous set of implications produced by the metaphors in Romans 8 rather than subtracted from it. However, this is not to say that the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is entirely parallel to the metaphors in Romans 8:15–23, but rather to point out that the rapid succession of the metaphors highlights the commonality between the believers and Israel rather than their differences. In light of this, the tenor of the metaphor should be understood as Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH, which in some way parallels God's covenant relationship with the believers in Romans 8.

40 These texts will be discussed in more detail below.

41 See Käsemann, *Romans*, 258.

42 E.g., Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 3–4; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 461; Moo, *Romans*, 562.

The Frame: Romans 9:1–5

Above I have alluded to the idea that the shift in focus from believers in Romans 8 to ethnic Israel in Romans 9 results in a different set of implications for the metaphorical utterance containing *υιοθεσία*. In chapter 2 I described differences in context with the term “frame,” suggesting that a change in a metaphor’s “frame” would result in a change in the meaning of the metaphor.⁴³ Here, then, it is worth pointing out that there has been a drastic shift in the frame of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors between Romans 8 and Romans 9. In Romans 8 the metaphorical utterances occurred as part of Paul’s extended discourse on the connection between the Spirit and the eschatological identity of the believers. In contrast, the metaphor in Romans 9:4 exists as part of a new section of the letter where Paul expositis on the fate of ethnic Israel. The change in the focus of chapters 9–11 constitutes a shift in the frame of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor, this shift in frame changes the meaning of the metaphor in Romans 9:4. Furthermore, the shift in frame also might add to, or alter slightly, the audience’s perception of *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 as the audience considers the two metaphors together.⁴⁴

Several previous studies on the *υιοθεσία* metaphors have sought to distill the metaphors into a single meaning by reading an Old Testament background into their use in Romans 8 based on Paul’s list of privileges in Romans 9:4.⁴⁵ This is an unnecessary false dichotomy because it is perfectly reasonable to expect that the different frames in Romans 8 and 9 will produce two slightly different meanings for these metaphors. While the frame in Romans 8 perhaps does not nudge the audience to consider the sonship tradition of the Old Testament, but rather remains squarely focused on the present situation and eschatological destiny of members of the community of faith, this is not the case in Romans 9. As we saw above, the content of Romans 9 is focused on the fate of ethnic Israel and the promises of God. Furthermore, within the immediate context of Romans 9:1–5 Paul is reflecting retrospectively on the fate of his kinsfolk in light of the Christ-event. This represents a considerable change in Paul’s tone from expectant eschatological hope in Romans 8 to anguish in Romans 9. Moreover, Paul is reflecting on the fate of Israel as *an Israelite*,⁴⁶ intensifying the emotional content of the passage as he draws the audience into the story of God’s people from past to present in his introductory

43 For a full explanation see chapter 2.

44 This will be discussed in greater detail in the section on metaphor and perception.

45 E.g., Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 79–139; Garner, “Adoption in Christ,” 42–55.

46 For a good explanation of the honor of the designation *Ἰσραηλῆτης* in Romans 9:4 see Moo, *Romans*, 560–61 (esp. 561 n. 30); Haacker, *Römer*, 208.

statement in Romans 9:1–5. The frame in Romans 9 both looks *back over the history of Israel* and to *its future destiny as the people of YHWH*. Therefore, while there is little to nudge the believers to consider their υιοθεσία in light of the sonship tradition of Israel in Romans 8, the same cannot be said here for Romans 9.

The drastic change in the metaphor's frame draws the sonship tradition of the Old Testament and the intertestamental literature clearly into view in Romans 9:4. While there may have been some members of Paul's audience who would have heard the sonship tradition in each of the previous υιοθεσία metaphors, here it is likely that the majority of Paul's audience would have understood υιοθεσία as evocative of Israel's covenant relationship with YHWH established long before the coming of Christ, and it is likely many would have identified υιοθεσία with other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition in particular. However, because a metaphor is not a neutral conduit of information, and because Paul uses υιοθεσία rather than υιός/υιοί (son/sons) or πρωτότοκος (firstborn) we must recognize that although Paul evokes the sonship tradition in Romans 9:4, he also reinterprets it by using a different metaphorical designation as a predication of Israel's historical covenant relationship.⁴⁷ I will examine Paul's interpretation of the sonship tradition and the intertextual relationships of Romans 9:4 in due course, but here it is enough to conclude that although the Jewish sonship tradition may not have been as important in Romans 8 or Galatians 4, Paul's change in frame in Romans 9 results in a greater awareness of possible intertextual relationships with Jewish sources for his audience members.

The Emphasis and Resonance of υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4

At this point some may argue that υιοθεσία is but one term among many in a list Paul gives of Israel's historic privileges, and that this rather mundane and unaccented occurrence should not be given a disproportionate amount of attention.⁴⁸ The reader must ask here, then, how emphatic and resonant is this occurrence of υιοθεσία, and what is its potential for shaping or reshaping the

47 The intertextual issue raised by the intersection of models will be discussed more thoroughly below.

48 Many commentaries only devote a sentence or two to υιοθεσία, and most imply that its reference is self-evident (e.g., Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, trans. Scott Hafemann [Louisville: WJK, 1994], 145; Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 286; Morris, *Romans*, 348; Frederic Godet, *Commentary on Romans* [Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977], 341). Indeed, even Scott's monograph devoted to the Pauline use of υιοθεσία only contains a one paragraph excurses on its meaning in Romans 9:4 (*Adoption as Sons*, 148–49).

perception, emotion, and identity of the community?⁴⁹ Recall that a metaphor is emphatic to the degree that its vehicle cannot be substituted for another vehicle and produce the same meaning.⁵⁰ Here then, the level of emphasis is determined by whether Paul could have used a different word than υιοθεσία to produce the same set of implications for the metaphor. Furthermore, alongside Black's understanding of emphasis we should also consider whether in this context υιοθεσία is "emphasized" in a more traditional understanding of "emphasis"—that is, whether the term would have stood out to the audience enough for them to reflect on its uniqueness.

As I have already noted, υιοθεσία is never used to describe the collective sonship of Israel anywhere in the LXX or in the intertestamental literature, which in itself makes Paul's use of it here rather striking. Furthermore, the other possible substitutes for υιοθεσία, such as υιός/υιοί (son/sons), πρωτότοκος (first-born), and μονογενής (only child) rely on models which differ in significant ways from υιοθεσία.⁵¹ On the other hand, as noted above, it may be that Paul only uses υιοθεσία for stylistic purposes, constrained as he is by his parallelism of feminine endings. However, even if it is the case that Paul's word choice is dictated by the parallelism he wishes to create, the parallelism itself draws attention to each term in the list, which potentially would cause the audience to carefully consider each of the terms.

Furthermore, Paul begins his new section in Romans 9:1 with the rather striking *asyndeton* Ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι . . . ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὁδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου (I speak the truth in Christ, I am not lying . . . that I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart), which not only is a drastic change in tone from the closing verses of chapter 8, (πέπεισμαι γὰρ ὅτι . . . οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν/For I am convinced that . . . nothing else in all of creation is able to separate us from the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our LORD), but also lacks a conjunction. Paul's lack of transition from Romans 8 to Romans 9 and his choice of words in Romans 9:1 suggests that

49 The specific ways in which Romans 9:4 might potentially affect the perception, emotion, and identity of Paul's audience will be explored in much greater detail below. Here we must concern ourselves with the question of whether it is even advisable to understand this metaphor as having the potential to influence the audience in this way at all.

50 See chapter 2 for a fuller treatment of emphasis and resonance; see also Black, "Metaphor," 26.

51 See also the explanation of model and metaphor in chapter 2.

he wished for this passage to be read “with striking emphasis and solemnity.”⁵² This solemn tone and slow cadence of the opening verses of Romans 9 suggests that although *υιοθεσία* occurs as a single term among a list, it carries at least a moderate degree of emphasis, meaning that the term itself is not replaceable with another term, and that the addressees would have had time to consider the term within its context in Romans 9:4.⁵³

Recall from the first chapter that a metaphor’s resonance is determined by the degree of implicative elaboration it supports.⁵⁴ Here, then, we must question whether the audience is encouraged to linger over *υιοθεσία* and contemplate its implications to determine the resonance of the metaphor. While it may be tempting in a study on *υιοθεσία* to conclude that each of its occurrences is both emphatic and resonant, it is somewhat difficult to argue that this is the case in Romans 9:4. Whereas Paul elaborates on each of the occurrences of *υιοθεσία* in Romans 8 in greater detail, and indeed the trajectory of the passage points to *υιοθεσία* as the pinnacle of redemption in Romans 8:23, the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is used as part of Paul’s introductory material to prove that God has not reneged on his promises to Israel. The vindication of God and the trustworthiness of his promises are the true themes of Romans 9–11, and the list of privileges in Romans 9:4 is but a dramatic introduction to Paul’s exposition of this theme. The nature of an introduction does not necessarily lend itself to inviting the audience to mull over its content, as its purpose is to prepare the way for a fuller explanation of its themes in what follows. Thus *υιοθεσία* here is not resonant in and of itself, but rather it plays a supporting role to the vindication of God’s historical actions and plan for Israel.

Perhaps it is best to think of Romans 9:1–5, and the *υιοθεσία* metaphor it contains, as an overture to the rest of Romans 9–11. As an overture, it introduces in brief the themes that are used in the rest of the chapters to tell the story of God and his covenant people, Israel. An overture’s themes may be emphatic and accented, but they are not resonant in our understanding of the word. A listener at an opera does not dwell on the themes of the overture after the first act has begun. However, the themes of the overture are carried through the

52 Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 451. See also Godet, who sees the asyndeton as “evidence of a lively emotion which, breaks, so to speak, the logical bond” but also “attests at the same time with all the more energy the profound relation of feeling which unites this piece [Romans 9] to the preceding” (*Commentary on Romans*, 338).

53 Indeed, each term in the list can be seen as emphatic, although it is unusual to make such a claim regarding a list. However, although the other terms in the list are not metaphorical, neither are they easily replaceable with other words.

54 See chapter 2 for a more detailed explanation; see also Black, “More About Metaphor,” 26.

arias and choruses of the opera, tying together the plot and giving depth to the characters. By this analogy, we should not expect that υιοθεσία has a high degree of resonance here, but rather that as part of the overture, Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor introduces the themes of Romans 9–11, and as the plot develops υιοθεσία colors God's actions for the reader and sheds light on his character as Paul's narrative unfolds. We then might think of the resonance of υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 subtly coloring Paul's assertion that "the children of the promise are counted as seed" (τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα) (Rom 9:8), his quotation from Hosea in Romans 9:25–26,⁵⁵ and his metaphor of the wild and natural branches of the olive tree (Rom 11:17–24). These resonances will be examined in more detail in the next section as they are an integral component to the intertextual relationships created by the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4. Though υιοθεσία is not particularly resonant in and of itself as part of a list in the introduction, there is, perhaps, a subliminal undercurrent of υιοθεσία that extends beyond the introduction of the chapters and surfaces at various times as a counter melody to the main theme of God's faithfulness in Romans 9–11.⁵⁶

Metaphor and Intertextuality in Romans 9:4

Although the previous exegetical chapters have not included a prolonged discussion on the intertextual relationships created by the metaphor, here such a discussion is necessary because of Paul's overt evocation of Israel's history in Romans 9:4–5, and because υιοθεσία does not occur in the LXX or in other Jewish literature. Moreover, although one might typically have expected a detailed survey of texts in the Israelite sonship tradition to be included in the introductory material, the complexity of intertextual relationships created between the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other Jewish texts are most visible and striking when they are examined side by side. In previous chapters I argued that intertextual relationships are both synchronic and diachronic, influenced both by previous texts and current cultural and lexical factors.⁵⁷ Though the possibility exists that there were subtle intertextual

55 "And in the very place it was said to them 'You are not my people,' there they will be called sons of the living God" (καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος).

56 For a fuller treatment of the structure and place of Rom 9:1–5 in Rom. 9–11 see Abasciano, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 36–41.

57 For a full explanation see chapters 2 and 4.

relationships present in Galatians 4 and Romans 8, in Romans 9 the intertextual relationships evoked and created by the υιοθεσία metaphor are much more overt. By ascribing υιοθεσία to the Israelites and grouping it with other well-known and easily recognizable privileges of ethnic Israel, Paul invites his readers to contemplate υιοθεσία as an historic privilege, which likely also entails his audience contemplating an intertextual relationship.⁵⁸ However, while some of the other privileges in Paul's list arguably have more straightforward intertextual relationships, such as νομοθεσία (giving of the law) recalling Mt. Sinai, or λατρεία (worship) recalling the temple cult, I would suggest that the intertextual interplay created by the intersection of υιοθεσία with texts in Israel's sonship tradition is more complex.

It is also necessary to recognize at the outset that Paul's reinterpretation of themes or elements in other sonship metaphors is not overt. Rather, Paul's use of υιοθεσία (rather than another term for sonship in Romans 9:4) is a subtle example of metalepsis. Hays remarks, "When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts."⁵⁹ Though Hays uses "echo" to describe the recollection of earlier texts, the vocabulary, or lexemes, of his echoes are most often also found in the original setting of the text.⁶⁰ The metalepsis in Romans 9:4 is a subtle evocation of the "Israelite sonship" tradition based on the interplay between "son/sons," (also "firstborn" and "only child") and "adoption," which is created entirely by Paul's unique vocabulary in his metaphor. Rather than overtly reinterpreting the "Israelite sonship" tradition, Paul's metaphor "places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences."⁶¹ Since the literary terminology of "echo" usually suggests that Paul is evoking an idea that is present in earlier texts, it may be more helpful to view Paul's use of υιοθεσία in Romans

58 The hypothetical situation where no intertextual relationship would be evoked would occur if a reader who had no knowledge of the Israelites or their Scriptures and traditions encountered Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4. This, of course, is highly unlikely.

59 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.

60 E.g., Hays identifies an echo in Phil 1:19 which reads τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν which, as Hays remarks, "is a verbatim citation of words lifted from Job 13:16" (ibid., 21). Hays also points to Rom 1:16–17 as an echo of Isa 51:4–5 and Isa 52:10, both of which reference righteousness, gentiles, and salvation (ibid., 36–37). In each instance the metalepsis Hays identifies is contingent upon a shared vocabulary, and while there is certainly overlap in the concept Paul evokes with his υιοθεσία metaphor, the metaphor relies on vocabulary unique to Paul. I would suggest that the change in vocabulary from other "Israelite sonship" metaphors is significant enough to merit a different label from Hays's "echo."

61 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.

9:4 instead as a “reflection.” As a “reflection,” υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 functions like Paul’s carefully chosen mirror that shows precisely those elements of the sonship tradition that he wishes to highlight.⁶²

Since Paul employs a unique vocabulary term—υιοθεσία—for his version of Israel’s designation as “son,” the analysis of the metaphor must consider how this term functions as a “reflection” of the sonship tradition. As a reflection, Paul’s use of “adoption” changes and alters the readers’ perception of Israel’s sonship in other texts where other terms are used. I will argue below that in the “points of resonance” created in the intertextual space between Paul’s metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other iterations of the sonship tradition, Paul engages and reinterprets several of the themes present in other examples of “Israelite sonship” metaphors.

As I will show in the analysis below, any investigation into the intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and texts in Israel’s sonship tradition needs to take seriously both Paul’s role as an interpreter within that tradition and the audience as recipients of Paul’s unique interpretation. Here then, the goal of this intertextual analysis will not be to trace the origin or development of the sonship tradition, but rather I will apply Peppard’s insightful question, “What meaningful connections would listeners likely have made, connections both intended and unintended by speakers?”⁶³ Since υιοθεσία is unique among other examples of sonship metaphors in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, this intertextual analysis will consider the possibility that Paul has chosen to use υιοθεσία in response to other sonship metaphors that would not have fitted with his theological understanding of God’s relationship with Israel. To examine this possibility I will first look at some examples of sonship metaphors from other sources in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, as these other occurrences of the sonship metaphor provide a window into some possible diachronic relationships that underlie the Pauline metaphor. The analysis of these texts will focus in particular on elements of these metaphors that may have been at odds with the Pauline image. I will then examine Paul’s unique “reflection” of that tradition and the peculiar emphasis of υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 against the backdrop of other occurrences of Israelite sonship metaphors.

Moreover, it must be recognized at the outset that “the sonship tradition” itself is not a monolithic entity. Indeed, there are many types of sonship

62 Though it may seem that mirrors are neutral and objective reflectors, consider how much impact the size and shape of the mirror, the color of the glass, the lighting, etc. have on constraining the reflection that one is able to see in the mirror.

63 Peppard, *The Son of God*, 27.

metaphors found in Jewish literature that are not as closely linked as the ones we will consider with Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in the list of privileges for the Israelites in Romans 9:4.⁶⁴ A variety of sonship metaphors appear in Jewish texts where the vehicle "son (or sons) of God" is used to describe angels or heavenly beings (e.g., Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7; Ps 29:1; Wis 5:5; 1 En. 69.4–5; 71.1; 106.5; T. Levi 4.2–4; T. Ab. 12.5; Pr. Jos. 6–8; Hist. Rech. 5.4; Philo, *QG* 1.91),⁶⁵ royalty (e.g., 2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chr 22:10; Ps 2:7; Jos. Asen. 21.3;),⁶⁶ messianic figures (e.g., Apoc. Ab. 2.1),⁶⁷ and wise or righteous people (e.g., Prov 3:11–12; Sir 4:10; Wis 2:12, 18;

64 "Son of God" also is clearly an important expression in Roman sources, though again these intertextual connections seem further afield than those in Jewish sources. For an excellent analysis of "son of god" as a Roman title see Peppard, *The Son of God*, 31–49.

65 The metaphors describing the sonship of angelic beings differ somewhat in their construction. In Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 38:7, and Ps 29:1 they are described as "sons of God" (most often: בני־האלהים/οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ but it is also worth noting that 1 Enoch uses the designation "sons of heaven" to refer to angelic beings (1 Enoch 6.2; 13.8; 14.3). For an analysis of the angelic beings in 1 Enoch see George Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* (Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 208–210; *idem*, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96.3 (1977): 383–405; Paul Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96.2 (1977): 195–233.

66 See Adela Yarbro Collins, and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–47; Larry Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 101–108; Trygve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBOT 8, Lund: Gleerup, 1976); G. Cooke, "The Israelite King as Son of God," *ZAW* 35 (1964): 22–47; Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96–120.

67 See Collins and Collins, *King and Messiah*; Magnus Zetterholm, "Pre-Christian Jewish Messianism: An Overview," in *The Messiah in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), xxi–xxvii; Stanley Porter, ed., *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*; John J. Collins, "The Son of God Text from Qumran," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 65–82; James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM, 1989). I would also note the importance of the metaphorical designation "son of man" and the correlated research on "son of man" for texts in this category. For an overview of recent scholarship see Larry Hurtado, and Paul Owen, eds., *Who is This Son of Man?: The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus* (London: T & T Clark, 2011); Delbert Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS 107, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). See also Collins, and Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God*, 75–100; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The One Who Is To Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007); Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 290–306; Adela Yarbro Collins, "The Origin of the Designation

Jos. Asen. 6.3; 13.10; 16.8; Philo, *Conf.* 145–47; *Spec.* 1.318),⁶⁸ in addition to the texts where “son/sons of God” is predicated of Israel and the Israelites. The diverse emphases of the sources containing sonship metaphors, and the diversity of the metaphors themselves, indicates that the designation “son of God” could and did connote a variety of things within Jewish literature. However, it is far beyond the scope of this study to address every occurrence of “son/sons of God” within Old Testament and intertestamental sources, especially if we were to take the multivalent nature of metaphor into account and address each of the sources and metaphors and the nuance of their particular implication complex. Here we must recognize that in undertaking an intertextual reading, one is necessarily confronted with the problem of which intertextual relationships to consider.⁶⁹ If lacking a clear rationale for the choice of some texts over others, the methodology can devolve quickly into arbitrariness, or the exegete can be overwhelmed by Jacob Neusner’s hyperbolic imperative that intertextuality requires him or her to “read everything in light of everything, everywhere, all at once.”⁷⁰ In light of this concern, the texts below were chosen because they contain particularly well-developed metaphors that make explicit reference to what I will hereafter refer to as “Israelite sonship.” I also must state at the outset of this analysis that it is not my intention here to use sonship metaphors to make a statement about the nature or development of Judaism(s)⁷¹ in general, as if the sonship metaphor represented a sort of microcosm of a widespread understanding of Jewish identity. My purpose in examining these texts is to bring them into conversation with the Pauline

of Jesus as ‘Son of Man,’” *HTR* 80 (1987): 391–408; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 65–97; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979).

68 See Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1976), 41–51; Simon S. Joseph, “Seek His Kingdom”: Q 12, 22b–31, God’s Providence, and Adamic Wisdom,” *Bib* 92.3 (2011): 392–410; Paul Overland, “Did the Sage Draw from the Shema? A Study of Proverbs 3:1–12,” *CBQ* 62 (2000): 424–40; Arndt Meinhold, “Gott und Mensch in Proverbien III,” *VT* 37.4 (1987): 468–77.

69 Stefan Alkier elucidates this problem well in his essay, “Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts,” in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Stefan Alkier, Richard B. Hays, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009), 3.

70 Neusner, *Canon and Connection*, xiii.

71 For differing perspectives on Judaism and Jewish sects see E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (NTL, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977), 425–28; Jacob Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, 2nd ed. (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003).

metaphor in Romans 9:4 to see how Paul's use of υἱοθεσία might be responding to or interpreting emphases found in some manifestations of "Israelite sonship" metaphors.

However, it is possible, as Byrne argues, that each of the texts in the diverse categories (angelic beings, royal figures, wise/righteous people, and messianic figures) contains a possible intertextual point of contact for υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4.⁷² To address Byrne's contention let me put forward an analogy: the intertextual relationships Paul's υἱοθεσία metaphor evokes in Romans 9:4 are like the concentric ripples caused by a water droplet upsetting the surface of a pond. By this analogy, texts where "son(s) of God" is used as a designation for the Israelites represent the highest waves nearest the center of the circle, and texts where the metaphor is used of angelic figures, the wise/righteous person, royalty, or messianic figures are the smaller, outer waves, which are still perceptible as the intertextual ripples dissipate. In this way, the text in Romans 9:4 itself provides the guidelines for determining the most pertinent intertextual relationships; clearly the closest points of contact are with other texts where Israel, or the Israelites are designated son/sons.⁷³ Therefore, the most pertinent texts for intertextual analysis are those that predicate sonship to Israel or Israelites because they are closest in proximity to Paul's metaphor.

Narrowing the focus to those texts where "son of God" is used as a designation for Israel or Israelites permits a better position to bring the distinct emphasis of Paul's metaphor into sharp relief; the collision of texts is the strongest and most observable closest to the center of the intertextual circle. Thus, because sonship is a privilege of the *Israelites* in Romans 9:4, the most suitable place to begin the analysis on the possible textual connections is texts where "Israel" or the "Israelites" are spoken of in terms of sonship. Therefore, while it is possible the intertextual echoes reverberate to farther removed texts where "son" denotes a wise or royal figure, or an angelic being (etc.), it is not unreasonable to proceed with the assumption that *the closest intertextual point of contact is to texts where a term denoting sonship is predicated of Israel or Israelites*. Since it is beyond the scope of this project to examine all types of sonship metaphors, and since the other types bear a more distant textual relationship to

72 Byrne, "Sons of God," 216–21. Byrne concludes, "Paul's understanding and employment of the 'sonship of God' idea is, then, intimately involved in his radical rethinking of Jewish theology... [which] all takes place within the conceptual framework of Judaism: Paul works within the Jewish categories, employs Jewish terminology, has recourse to the Jewish basis of proof—Scripture" (ibid., 220).

73 For more on the text constraining intertextual relationships see Holthuis, *Intertextualität*, 180.

Romans 9:4, I will limit my analysis below to the Jewish texts that contain references to *Israel's sonship* rather than considering the vehicle "sonship" in more general terms.

One further complication to the task of analyzing intertextual connections is the fact that the texts which will be examined below do not use "sonship" with an identical emphasis or context. Moreover, the occurrences I will examine possess intertextual relationships with one another, and any one of them could be analyzed in its own right. Each sonship metaphor had its own context with its own level of emphasis and resonance, its particular focus and frame, and its unique set of implications, albeit with some similarities. Thus, one cannot think of Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 unilaterally drawing upon "the sonship tradition," or interpreting each and every occurrence of "sonship" in precisely the same way. Rather, considering the intertextual relationship between Paul's text and other texts in the tradition requires thinking of Paul as both an interpreter of other sonship metaphors, and a creator of his own metaphor with its own point of view that speaks into this tradition.

Paul's text in Romans 9:4 becomes another voice in the conversation of various sources using the sonship texts; each text, as Brawley says "sings in its own voices even as its voices also sing . . . in harmony, or in discord with voices of the other."⁷⁴ Thus the examination below will stress areas of harmony and discord between Paul's metaphor and other metaphors of Israelite sonship. My aim will be to notice themes in other texts that Paul affirms in his use of υἱοθεσία, as well as places where Paul provides a somewhat jarring reinterpretation of the themes found in other texts, while also recognizing that Paul's metaphor represents Paul's own voice. His voice may have been influenced by other voices and variations in the sonship tradition, but the use of the υἱοθεσία metaphor is uniquely Pauline and so we must attune ourselves accordingly to appreciate its variation of an Israelite sonship metaphor.

The Old Testament Literature

Though the occurrences of the sonship metaphors in the Old Testament are not frequent, nor easily systematized, they do all seem to utilize the vehicle "sonship" to express some aspect of the covenant relationship between YHWH and Israel (e.g., intimacy, discipline, the faithfulness of YHWH vs. the faithlessness of Israel). The first occurrence of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor in the Old Testament appears in Exodus 4:22:⁷⁵ "Thus the LORD says 'Israel is my son,

⁷⁴ Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, 6.

⁷⁵ "Sons of God" in Gen 6:4 is the earliest appearance of the metaphor, but there the phrase is used as a description of angelic beings.

well-being.”⁸² In addition this is a prime example of the power of metaphor to reframe the Israelite experience of wandering in order to deemphasize the difficulty of the experience and highlight the connection between wandering and their special privilege as sons of YHWH.

With a slightly different emphasis than in Deuteronomy 8:5, Deuteronomy 14:1 uses a sonship metaphor to express Israel’s covenant obligations. Here the text reads, “You are sons of the LORD your God, you must not lacerate yourselves or shave your forelocks for the dead.”⁸³ What is perhaps most striking about this occurrence of the metaphor is its construction. Gerhard von Rad notes that the form “sons of YHWH” “is unique in Deuteronomy and in the whole of the Old Testament as well.”⁸⁴ This is the single instance in the Old Testament where the Israelites are referred to as “sons” (plural) of YHWH, and this designation functions as a rationale for the Israelites to maintain their distance from the practices of other nations.⁸⁵ Furthermore, this text in Deuteronomy closely connects the sonship metaphor with the election of Israel. Deuteronomy 14:2 continues, “For you are a people holy to the LORD your God, it is you the LORD has chosen out of all the peoples on earth to be his people, his treasured possession.”⁸⁶ Here Israel’s sonship is presented as an exclusive category that pertains to ethnic Israel as a national and religious entity in contrast with “all the peoples on earth.”⁸⁷ Brueggemann remarks that “of all the available peoples to whom YHWH might be especially attached, Israel is the one on which YHWH has settled affection, intimacy, and special privilege.”⁸⁸ It is important to note

82 Walter Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001), 106–107.

83 בנים אתם יהוה אלהיכם לא תתגדדו ולא־תשימו קרחה בין עיניכם למת / Υἱοὶ ἐστε κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, οὐ φοιρήσετε, οὐκ ἐπιθήσετε φαλάκρωμα ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ νεκρῷ (Deut 14:1).

84 Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, trans. Dorothea Barton (AOTC, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 101.

85 Von Rad comments that the purpose of the statement was likely to encourage “refraining from certain ritual practices,” and in particular, “all forms of the cult of the dead” (Ibid.); see also A. D. H. Mayes, “Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview,” in *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, et. al. (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 165–81.

86 כי עם קדוש אתה יהוה אלהיך ובך בחר יהוה להיות לו לעם סגלה מכל העמים אשר על־פני / ὅτι λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ κύριῳ τῷ θεῷ σου, καὶ σὲ ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς (Deut 14:2).

87 Von Rad comments, “The concept of ‘holy’ does not denote a particular human quality, but chiefly the idea of being singled out for Yahweh and the idea of the inviolability derived from this” (*Deuteronomy*, 101).

88 Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, 157.

that Deuteronomy 14:1 does not present Israel's sonship as conditional upon their behavior. Israel's sonship is not a result of their obedience, but rather it is the basis for their obedience, which was established at the time of YHWH's initiation of a covenant relationship with Israel.⁸⁹ Furthermore, by insisting that the Israelites as the sons of YHWH exhibit behavior that marks them out from other nations, the metaphor in Deuteronomy 14:1 undergirds a sense of unique identity that is created through Israel's sonship.

We see the reverse side of the same connection between moral behavior and sonship later in Deuteronomy 32 in the song of Moses, where Moses chastises the nation of Israel for being "degenerate sons" and "a crooked and perverse generation" (Deut 32:5).⁹⁰ Here Israel's offense is against YHWH the "father who created you" (Deut 32:6),⁹¹ whom Israel has forgotten (Deut 32:18).⁹² In contrast to the sonship metaphor in Deuteronomy 14:1 where the focus is on the covenant obligations of the sons, in Deuteronomy 32:5 it is YHWH as the faithful father to his disobedient children that is drawn into view.⁹³ Indeed, as J. G. McConville remarks, "The accusation that Israel has been false is all the more telling for Yahweh's truth and trustworthiness."⁹⁴ However, Israel's disobedience in Deuteronomy 32:5 is still presented as the disobedience of *sons*. McConville further observes, "This rebellion flies in the face of *Yahweh's strong attachment to them*."⁹⁵ Still, their disobedience results in punishment, not disownment.

89 Ibid.

90 לֹא בָנוּ מוֹמִים דּוֹר עֶקֶשׁ וּפְתִילֵת / הָמָרְטוֹסָאן οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά, γενεά σκολιά καὶ διεστραμμένη (Deut 32:5). Isaiah 1:2 expresses something quite similar: שְׁמַעוּ שָׁמַיִם וְהָאֲרֶץ כִּי יְהוָה דִּבֶּר בָּנִים גְּדֹלְתִי וְרוֹמְמֹתִי וְהֵם פָּשְׁעוּ בִּי ἄκουε, οὐρανέ, καὶ ἐνωτίζου, γῆ, ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησεν, υἱοὺς ἐγέννησα καὶ ᾤψωσα, αὐτοὶ δέ με ἠθέτησαν ("Hear, O heavens, and listen, O earth; for the LORD has spoken: I reared sons and brought them up, but they have rebelled against me"). See also Mal 1:6 for a similar sonship metaphor where Israel's disobedience is presented as rebellion against YHWH as father.

91 תַּגְמִלּוּ זֵאת עִם נָבֵל וְלֹא חָכָם הֲלוֹא הוּא אֲבִיךָ קִנְךָ הוּא עֶשֶׂךָ וּיְכַנְנֶךָ ἀνταποδίδετε οὕτω, λαὸς μωρὸς καὶ οὐχὶ σοφός; οὐκ αὐτὸς οὐτός σου πατήρ ἐκτίσαστό σε καὶ ἐποίησέν σε καὶ ἔκτισέν σε; (Deut 32:6).

92 Both father and mother metaphors are predicated of YHWH in the course of Deuteronomy 32, but YHWH's relationship with Israel as "sons" is the tenor of them throughout the chapter.

93 Von Rad, *Deuteronomy*, 196.

94 J. G. McConville, *Deuteronomy* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary, Leicester: Apollos, 2002), 453.

95 Ibid. (emph. mine).

Moreover, the text of Deuteronomy 32 presents a more nuanced view of Israel's relationship to other nations. Though Deuteronomy 32:9 calls Israel "the LORD's own portion" from among the nations,⁹⁶ later YHWH says, "I will hide my face from them" (Deut 32:20). Richard Nelson remarks that YHWH's action here indicates anger or "revulsion over such behavior."⁹⁷ Israel's punishment for their faithlessness is to make them jealous with "what is no people" and provoking them with "a foolish nation" (Deut 32:21).⁹⁸ Though the text does not necessarily imply that YHWH has disowned Israel as his son, the word-play between "what is no god (בְּלֹא־אֱלֹהִים/ὁὐ θεὸς)/what is no people (בְּלֹא־עַם/οὐκ ἔθνη)" might suggest a reversal in status between Israel and this "non-nation." However, Brueggemann argues that the punishment Israel receives for their foolishness has been predetermined by the covenant conditions. He asserts, "What Israel is to suffer is not due to divine capriciousness, but on the basis of sanctions already known ahead of time."⁹⁹ Therefore we might conclude from this text that although Israel has been a faithless son, YHWH is still presented as a disciplining father, and that despite Israel's disobedience, YHWH does not take any other nation to be his own.

There are also several texts in the prophetic literature in the Old Testament that employ variations of an "Israelite sonship" metaphor. In occurrences very much parallel to those in Deuteronomy, Isaiah uses metaphors of sonship both positively as descriptions of YHWH's faithfulness and negatively for Israel's disobedience. In Isaiah 30:1–11, YHWH refers to the Israelites as "stubborn sons (בָּנִים סוֹרְרִים/τέκνα ἀποστάται)" "lying sons (בָּנִים כַּחֲשִׁים/υἱοὶ ψευδεῖς) and "sons unwilling to hear the law of the LORD" (בָּנִים לֹא־אָבוּ שְׁמוֹעַ תּוֹרַת יְהוָה/οἱ οὐκ ἠβούλουντο ἀκούειν τὸν νόμον τοῦ θεοῦ). It is significant that the woe oracle begins with YHWH addressing the Israelites *as his sons*. Brevard Childs remarks that here the introductory divine speech "designates the addressee and often the grounds for the ensuing polemic."¹⁰⁰ Under Child's assertion, the addressees of YHWH's polemic are then specifically his sons, the Israelites, and the grounds for the polemic is their disobedience to him.

We see another example of a sonship metaphor in Isaiah 43:6–7 where the people of Israel are gathered from the diaspora as the sons and daughters

96 חֶלֶק יְהוָה עִמּוֹ יַעֲקֹב חֵבֶל נַחֲלָתוֹ /καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (Deut 32:9).

97 Richard Nelson, *Deuteronomy* (OTL, Louisville: WJK, 2002), 373.

98 אֲכַעֲסִם נָבֵל אֲכַעֲסִם בְּלֹא־עַם וְאֲנִי אֲקַנְיָאם בְּלֹא־עַם בְּגוֹי נָבֵל אֲכַעֲסִם /καὶ γὰρ παραζηλώσω αὐτοὺς ἐπ' οὐκ ἔθνη, ἐπ' ἔθνη ἀσυνέτω παροργίζω αὐτούς (Deut 32:21).

99 Brueggemann, *Deuteronomy*, 280.

100 Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL, Louisville: WJK, 2001), 224.

of YHWH. The construction of the metaphor in Isaiah 43:6–7 is particularly interesting because it includes the “daughters” of YHWH alongside his “sons.” By using these filial metaphors in tandem, the text grounds the return of the exiles in YHWH’s fatherhood and his particular covenant relationship with his people, Israel.¹⁰¹ This text also connects Israel’s sonship (and daughterhood) with YHWH as the creator of his covenant people (see also Isa 64:8; Mal 2:10). YHWH who gathers his people from the corners of the earth (Isa 43:5–6), is also the God who created them (Isa 43:1), and brings the Israelites safely through fire, water, and the schemes of their enemies (Isa 43:2–4).

This sonship metaphor in Isaiah 63:7–8 frames YHWH’s mercy and covenant faithfulness as the care that a father has bestowed on his sons, but unlike other positive uses of the metaphor that employ similar terminology, here the tone of the passage is clearly that of a lament.¹⁰² The metaphor occurs in a summary of YHWH’s gracious acts toward his people, and the text indicates that on account of Israel’s sonship, YHWH became the savior of Israel (Isa 63:7), and he redeemed them because of his love and mercy (Isa 63:9). Unlike some of the other texts we have examined, Isaiah 63:7–8 seems to put a condition on Israel’s sonship. YHWH declares “surely they are . . . sons who will not act falsely,” which could be read as a stipulation to their sonship.¹⁰³ More likely, however, is that the condition in Isaiah is precisely the kind of covenant condition invoked in Deuteronomy 32. Here again it would seem that it is not Israel’s status as son that is at stake, but rather their impending punishment for their rebellion according to the covenant, which the text goes on to describe (Isa 63:10).

Likewise, when Jeremiah looks forward to the restoration of Israel after the exile, he grounds YHWH’s action in Israel’s sonship. Here YHWH declares, “With consolations I will lead them back . . . for I have become a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn” (Jer 31:9).¹⁰⁴ We must also note that Jeremiah

101 Childs, *Isaiah*, 335.

102 Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66*, trans. David M. G. Stalker (OTL, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 386.

103 Westermann perhaps hints at this possibility when he says, “Implicit in this, however, was an expectation—that as his sons they would be loyal and true to him” (*ibid.*, 387).

104 בבכי יבאו ובתחנונים אובילים אוליכם אל-נחלי מים בדרך ישר לא יכשלו בה כִּי־הייתי לישראל הוֹא ברכי הוֹא לְאָב וּאֶפְרַיִם בְּכֹרִי הוֹא (Jer 31:9 [38:9 LXX]). Though the date of this oracle is a matter of some debate (see Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36* [ABC, New York: Doubleday, 2004], 420) it is likely that this passage (Jer 31:7–9) is genuinely Jeremiah (see William Holladay, *Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time* [Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1974], 107–21) and should be dated “either in Josiah’s reign or close to the fall of Jerusalem” (Lundbom, *Jeremiah 21–36*, 420).

uses the language of “a remnant” being brought back (Jer 31:7).¹⁰⁵ However, the prophetic use of “remnant (שְׁאֵרִית יִשְׂרָאֵל)” is only distantly connected to the Pauline concept of the remnant that I will examine in greater detail below. E. W. Heaton argues that the term “remnant” in Jeremiah (and the whole of the OT) “primarily directs attention not forward to the residue, but *backwards* to the whole of which it had been a part.”¹⁰⁶ The same sentiment is echoed in Hosea 2:1 (1:10), where in a dramatic shift in tone from Hosea 1:6–9, the sons of Israel are renamed “sons of the living God.”¹⁰⁷ Hosea’s depiction of Israel’s sonship here looks forward to their future restoration, rather than the metaphor describing their present state (e.g., Exod 4:22), or providing a rationale for their particular behavior (e.g., Deut 14:1). Instead, in these passages the historic nation of Israel is recast as the eschatological people of YHWH.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, it is important to note that it is not Israel’s repentance that leads to YHWH’s declaration of renewed sonship. Rather, these passages represent YHWH’s paradigmatic action toward his sons that initiates their restoration and repentance.

Though the sonship metaphors in these Old Testament texts contain different emphases and are used in different contexts, very broad generalizations can be made regarding “Israelite sonship” metaphors as a group. The preferred terms for the vehicles of the “Israelite sonship” metaphors are generic, and derived from the Hebrew root בן (בֵּן LXX) translated “son” or “sons” (e.g., Exod 4:22; Deut 8:5; 14:1–2; 32:20; Isa 30:1; Isa 43:6–7; Isa 63:8; Hos 2:1 [1:10]), though occasionally Israel is referred to more specifically as the “firstborn” (בְּכֹר / πρωτότοκος) of YHWH. The “Israelite sonship” metaphors tend to use sonship to express various aspects of YHWH’s covenant relationship with them. In some instances sonship metaphors are used in order to evoke a particular behavior from the Israelites, in others the metaphor provides a framework through which the Israelites can understand YHWH’s disciplinary actions toward them (e.g., Deut 8:5; 32:5–6; Isa 30:1–11; Hos 1:6–9). Furthermore, in most of the texts

105 There is considerable consensus among OT scholars that the original Hebrew (based on a reconstruction of T and the LXX) reads הוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה אֶת עַמּוֹ (YHWH has saved his people) and that the MT imperative הוֹשִׁעַ is incorrect. Holladay remarks, “The form of the text in *M* . . . is understandable, given the pressures of the postexilic period, but surely wrong” (*Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, chapters 26–52*, ed. Paul D. Hanson [Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989], 184).

106 E. W. Heaton, “The Root שָׂרָא and the Doctrine of the Remnant,” *JTS* 3.1 (1952): 29.

107 והיה מספר בני־ישראל כחול הים אשר לא־ימד ולא יספר והיה במקום אשר־יאמר להם יהוה מספר בני־ישראל כחול הים אשר לא־ימד ולא יספר והיה במקום אשר־יאמר להם בני־אל־חי / Καὶ ἵν' ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἣ οὐκ ἐκμετρηθήσεται οὐδὲ ἐξαριθμηθήσεται, καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαὸς μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος. (Hos 2:1 MT/LXX).

108 *Ibid.*, 207.

where Israel is punished they are punished as *sons of YHWH who have broken the covenant* (see esp. Deut 32:19–21; Isa 30:1–11). Sonship metaphors also often appear in close connection with YHWH's election of Israel to be his chosen people, and Israel's sonship is sometimes set in contrast with "other nations" (e.g., Deut 14:1–2; 32:20; Isa 43:3–7). By emphasizing Israel's status as a nation set apart, the sonship metaphors connote the unique privilege and position of the Israelites as the chosen people of YHWH, whom YHWH created for himself.¹⁰⁹ "Israelite sonship" can also be used to highlight YHWH's faithfulness to his people, and at least Hosea 2:1 connects YHWH's faithfulness to the eschatological restoration of the Israelites as sons of YHWH. Lastly, none of the occurrences of "Israelite sonship" metaphors refer to an explicit instance of adoption, nor does any occurrence obviously imply that the quality of Israel's sonship is to be understood as adoption.¹¹⁰ In light of this evidence, one possible explanation for Paul's use of υἱοθεσία as a term for Israel's sonship is that Paul has coined a new term that possibly reinterprets facets of the framework of sonship constructed by the "Israelite sonship" metaphors in the Old Testament.

The Intertestamental Literature

In labeling the literature in this section "intertestamental," I do not wish to make a specific claim regarding the date of this literature (either as post-dating the entirety of the Old Testament or as ante-dating the New Testament), but rather to address a group of sources from various dates and provenances that provide a reflection on the Old Testament literature and which have clearly been influenced by Hellenism and apocalypticism. I also note here that although there are numerous instances where the term "son of God" appears in intertestamental sources in connection with angelic figures, messianic figures, and wise people,¹¹¹ I again will focus only on those texts where "Israelite

¹⁰⁹ Byrne, "Sons of God," 16.

¹¹⁰ Pace Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 96–120, 205–13, Sigmund Mowinckel, *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in Israel and Later Judaism*, trans. G. W. Anderson (Nashville: Abingdon, 1956), 78. Andersen and Freedman also fail to distinguish between metaphorical adoption and metaphorical birth in their analysis, saying "it is clear that the title 'child' is conferred by adoption. . . . [The Israelites] abhorred the idea of people as the offspring of God, not to belittle people, but to protect Yahweh from any suggestion of sexuality" (Francis Andersen, and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea* [Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980], 206). However, metaphorical predications that rely on birth imagery for their models (e.g., בְּכֹר in Jer 31:9) do not imply "sexuality," and calling Israel's sonship "adoptive" unnecessarily introduces a foreign and anachronistic concept (adoption) into the discussion.

¹¹¹ See Byrne, "Sons of God," 9–78.

sonship” metaphors appear, since these texts provide the most direct parallel with the Pauline usage in Romans 9:4. Furthermore, due to the large number of references to “Israelite sonship” it is necessary to limit this analysis to those passages where the metaphor is emphatic or resonant in its own right, or to texts where unique terminology for Israel’s sonship is used.

Israelite Sonship in the Book of Wisdom

Two passages from the book of Wisdom contain highly developed versions of an “Israelite sonship” metaphor: 12:19–22, and 18:1–4.¹¹² These metaphors both occur in the section of Wisdom devoted to the salvation of God’s people in the exodus event, and in each the metaphor is being used to communicate Israel’s sense of national identity. Although Byrne argues in his treatment of Wisdom that Israel functions as the “type” of the just in chapters 10–19,¹¹³ Barclay’s case that Wisdom represents a “deeply Hellenized exercise in cultural aggression,” where the “predominant theme . . . is in fact the social conflict and cultural antagonism between Jews and non-Jews”¹¹⁴ provides a much more compelling backdrop for the sonship theme.

The first passage, Wisdom 12:19–22, occurs within an extended reflection of Israel’s salvation in the exodus event (Wis 11–19). This example of an “Israelite sonship” metaphor is striking precisely because the metaphor illuminates the “conflict between the Jewish community and others.”¹¹⁵ Wisdom 12:19–22 reads,

112 There is also an Israelite sonship metaphor in Wis 16:24–26, but it is not quite as well-developed and contains similar themes to 12:19–22 and 18:1–4 and so it will be omitted from the discussion below. The one notable difference in the metaphor is the role of creation in caring for the sons of YHWH and punishing their enemies. Samuel Cheon remarks, “Creation works for the salvation of the righteous and the judgment of the unrighteous. . . . In the plagues the cosmic elements worked to punish the Egyptians, whereas in the wilderness events they served to benefit the Israelites” (*The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* [JSPSup 23, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997], 123).

113 Byrne, “*Sons of God*,” 44 n. 129.

114 John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 33, Berkley: University of California Press, 1996), 184. Robert Siebencek expresses similar sentiment: “A justification of the Jewish way of life, stated in terms of Greek culture and with its finesse, was the need of the moment. The book is therefore a rhetorical exhortation, intended to encourage, reassure, and revitalize the Jews in Alexandria by restating the case for Hebrew wisdom (“The Midrash of Wisdom 10–19,” *CBQ* 22 (1960): 176. Cheon attempts to pinpoint the date and provenance of the book even more precisely to the riots in Alexandria in 38 CE (*Exodus Story*, 147).

115 Cheon, *Exodus Story*, 145.

Through such works you have taught your people that the righteous must be kind, and you have filled your sons with good hope (καὶ εὐέλπιδας ἐποίησας τοὺς υἱοὺς σου), because you give repentance for sins. For if you punished with such great care and indulgence the enemies of your servants/children (ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου) and those deserving of death, granting them time and opportunity to give up their wickedness, with what strictness you have judged your sons (μετὰ πόσης ἀκριβείας ἔκρινας τοὺς υἱοὺς σου), to whose ancestors you gave oaths and covenants full of good promises! So while chastening us you scourge our enemies ten thousand times more, so that, when we judge, we may meditate upon your goodness, and when we are judged, we may expect mercy.

In this text the sonship metaphor contains connotations of exclusivity (τοὺς υἱοὺς σου vs. ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου), which from the context are, in fact, ethnic divisions between the Israelites and the Egyptians. God is punishing not his own enemies but the enemies of his children. Moreover, Wisdom 12:19–22 contains a sharp contrast between God's disciplinary action towards Israel as sons which is depicted as redemptive, and his actions toward other nations which are retributive. The Israelites are “chastened,” while their enemies are “scourged.” This contrast could be evidence of what Cheon labels the “apologetic tendency” of Wisdom. The text's portrayal of the Israelites as “the righteous” and the Egyptians as “the wicked” is therefore most likely an “apologetic counteraction.”¹¹⁶ The dichotomy between the Israelite sons and the enemy Egyptians in this text is likely intended to reinforce the boundary between the author's Jewish audience and their Hellenistic milieu, and thus the sonship metaphor in this text serves to undergird their distinctive cultural identity.

Another prominent “Israelite sonship” metaphor follows on the heels of the author's description of the plague of darkness that falls upon the Egyptians. Drawing a stark contrast between the Israelites and the Egyptians, chapter 18 describes the situation of the Israelites as full of light, illuminated by YHWH. Here we read,

But for your holy ones there was very great light. Their enemies heard their voices but did not see their forms, and counted them happy for not having suffered, and were thankful that your holy ones, though previously wronged, were doing them no injury; and they begged their pardon for having been at variance with them. Therefore you provided a flaming pillar of fire as a guide for your people's unknown journey, and a

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 149.

harmless sun for their glorious wandering. For their enemies deserved to be deprived of light and imprisoned in darkness, those who had kept your sons imprisoned (οἱ κατακλείστους φυλάξαντες τοὺς υἱοὺς σου), through whom the imperishable light of the law was to be given to the world (18:1–4).

The most striking feature of this example is perhaps its polemical tone toward Israel's enemies, who “deserved to be deprived of light” (ἄξιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι στερηθῆναι φωτός) for their treatment of YHWH's sons. In contrast, Israel's sonship is spoken of in glowing terms, set alongside their receiving of the law as an “imperishable light” (τὸ ἄφθαρτον νόμου φῶς). The connection of law and sonship is likely meant to evoke the giving of the law and the confirmation of the Mosaic covenant in Exodus 20–24. This statement might perhaps, as some have argued, recognize “the world-wide mission of the Jewish nation.”¹¹⁷ However, it is more likely that this passage both reflects and reinforces the corporate identity and self-perception of the Jewish community.¹¹⁸ Under this reading the “Israelite sonship” metaphor is employed to remind the Jewish audience of their unique identity as the chosen people of YHWH—his sons who have been entrusted with the law. The combination of “your holy ones” (τοῖς ὁσίοις σου in Wis 18:1) and the “Israelite sonship” metaphor also indicates a connection between election and sonship, though since there is no direct reference to YHWH's creation of Israel it is perhaps not as strong here as in some other texts examined above (e.g., Deut 32:6–20; Isa 43:1–7).

Israelite Sonship in Joseph and Aseneth

The inclusion of an “Israelite sonship” metaphor in Joseph and Aseneth merits consideration because the narrative focuses so heavily on the conversion of Aseneth, a gentile.¹¹⁹ Because her conversion occupies such a central place in

117 J. A. F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 171; see also Louis Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 293.

118 John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL, Louisville: WJK Press, 1997), 154.

119 Although Ross Shepard Kraemer's recent work has called the date, setting, and narrative focus of *Joseph and Aseneth* into question, further study is needed to confirm the late date (4th century CE) and the Syrian (Christian?) setting she posits. Moreover, contrary to Kraemer's assertions, Aseneth's conversion does seem to propel the narrative forward and resolve the conflict, as it is precisely her renunciation of idols that leads Joseph to accept her (e.g., 19.5). Furthermore, although Kraemer shows some striking comparisons with the Odes of Solomon, many of the motifs that she examines have close parallels with earlier Jewish texts (e.g., mystical encounters with divine beings, the righteous being accorded

the story, much of the dramatic action that takes place is the result of the tension between the narrative's two groups of people: Jews and gentiles. Randall Chesnutt observes, "[L]anguage has as its primary function here that of setting the Jew apart from the non-Jew and justifying the social separation which the former must maintain from the latter."¹²⁰ Following Chesnutt, I would argue that the Israelite sonship metaphor in Joseph and Aseneth functions to undergird the social, religious, and even ethnic boundaries around the Jewish community presented in the story. However, Joseph and Aseneth also presents a unique difficulty because it is hard to pinpoint the precise characteristics of the Judaism it describes. C. Burchard notes that if "we ask what Judaism as depicted in Joseph and Aseneth is like, it is easier to say what it is not."¹²¹ Though the narrative of Joseph and Aseneth ostensibly opens the possibility for non-Jews to participate in the blessing and fellowship of the Jews as members of the covenant community, it seems that it is still largely governed by a culturally antagonistic mindset toward gentiles and their practices.¹²² Below I will examine this tone vis-à-vis the sonship metaphor, which provides an interesting perspective on Aseneth's identity prior to and after her conversion.

Though Joseph and Aseneth contains numerous non-Israelite references to "son of God (i.e., angels or royal figures),"¹²³ the discussion will be limited to the Israelite sonship metaphor in 19.8. Once she has undergone her conversion, Joseph calls Aseneth a "City of Refuge," and lauds her "because the *sons of the living God* will dwell in your City of Refuge, and the LORD God will reign as

"angelic" status, and perhaps most significant, the text's need to explain Joseph's marriage to a non-Jew (*When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998], 225–85).

120 Randall D. Chesnutt, "The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth," *JSP* 2 (1988): 24.

121 C. Burchard, "Joseph and Aseneth," in *OTP*, vol.2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 194.

122 Burchard remarks that "Proselytes are welcomed, not sought, and conversion certainly is not an easy affair" (ibid., 195 [emph. mine]). This cultural antagonism is seen particularly clearly in Joseph's revulsion of Aseneth, and the necessity of Aseneth's thorough conversion and repudiation of her former way of life and religion before she is acceptable as a bride (e.g., 8.5–11; 9.1; 10.12–17; 11.3–5, 16–18; 12.5–15; 19.5).

123 Joseph is repeatedly referred to as a "son of God" throughout the text of Joseph and Aseneth and these occurrences are particularly difficult to categorize, though they share much in common with texts where "son of God" refers to an angelic figure or to royal sonship passages (e.g., 6.5, 13.13–14; 14.9–10; 18.11; 21.4).

king over them for ever and ever" (Jos. Asen. 19.8).¹²⁴ Moreover, Aseneth later receives the designation "Daughter of the Most High" alongside Joseph, who is the "firstborn son of God" (21.4). From these descriptions there is little doubt that Aseneth has gained full inclusion in the covenant people of Israel, which makes this "Israelite sonship" reference important because it would seem that under certain circumstances "Israelite sonship" can be extended to gentiles.

However, while the author of Joseph and Aseneth seems set on portraying Aseneth as worthy not only as a wife to Joseph, but also of full inclusion in the Israelite community, he also takes great pains to show that Aseneth is not like other Egyptian women (1.5) and that she was a virtuous virgin (1.4–6; 2.1; 7.8). He also documents her ostracism from her family and friends in order to show that she has completely separated from her gentile origins (11.4–6; 12.12–14; 13.1). The author's frequent and diverse attempts to defend Aseneth's right to full inclusion in the community may suggest that there are some in the author's community who have a more negative stance toward proselytes.¹²⁵ Furthermore, the author of Joseph and Aseneth seems quite preoccupied with demonstrating that the distinct identity of the Israelites is maintained despite Aseneth's inclusion. Indeed, Aseneth has undergone so much of a transformation that she is nearly unrecognizable as the gentile princess from the start of the narrative. In light of the author's concern to maintain a distinct Jewish identity, I would suggest that rather than Joseph and Aseneth widening the possible scope of "sons of God" to apply also to gentiles, the effect is quite the reverse. That Aseneth is counted a "daughter of the Most High" alongside the "sons of God," in fact, highlights the metaphor's use as a designation for the Israelites who are God's people distinct from other nations.

Israelite Sonship in 3 Maccabees

Third Maccabees contains two important instances of the sonship metaphor that occur in close succession and together provide an interesting lens onto

¹²⁴ Byrne sees the reference in Jos. Asen. 19.8 as an example of gentile inclusion in the designation "sons of God." He states "The 'sons' include now the Gentiles (as proselytes) who, like Asenath, have won a share in the sonship privilege of Israel by repentance and conversion to the true God," *"Sons of God,"* 53. However, Byrne might move too quickly in equating "sons of the living God" in 19.8 with the "many nations" who take refuge in Aseneth in 15.7 and 19.6. In the context of 19.8 there is nothing that indicates that the designation has been extended beyond the confines of ethnic Israel, or that Joseph has reinterpreted Hos 2:1 to apply to gentile proselytes. Rather, in 19.8 it is Aseneth who is held up as the proselyte *par excellence*, evidenced by her designation as "City of Refuge" for the ethnic people of Israel alongside the people of "many nations."

¹²⁵ Chesnutt, "Social Setting and Purpose," 33.

the concerns and persuasions of the author, whom H. Anderson describes as “a staunch conservative, swimming against the stream of the more radical tendencies of his time.”¹²⁶ This is particularly true with the first occurrence of the sonship metaphor, which is placed on the lips of the tyrant Philopater who declares,

²⁷Loose, yes loose completely their [the Israelites'] unrighteous bonds. Send them back to their homes in peace, asking their forgiveness for what has been done to them. ²⁸Release the sons of the all-conquering, living God of heaven (ἀπολύσατε τοὺς υἱὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ ζώντος) (3 Macc 6.27–28).

The narrator then gives a rejoinder that echoes the same sentiment a few verses later saying, “Knowing of a surety that God in heaven protects the Jews, in alliance with them continually like a father with his sons (3 Macc 7.6).”¹²⁷ The identity of the Israelites as the sons of YHWH is affirmed both by the gentile king and by the narrator, and both speakers use the metaphor in a way that underscores the particularism of the Jewish people.¹²⁸ However, the author of 3 Maccabees does not concern himself with making a proselyte of the gentile king; he is content to maintain Israel’s particularism, for which Philopater is made the unwitting spokesperson.¹²⁹ Furthermore, 3 Maccabees uses the sonship metaphor as a rationale to explain the actions of YHWH on behalf of his people, which is also a prominent theme throughout the book (e.g., 2.2–20; 6.2–15). Here we see that Israel’s sonship is connected with YHWH’s continual care and “alliance with them” as their father (7:6–7). Thus in 3 Maccabees the Israelite sonship metaphor is intimately connected with Jewish particularism and an assurance that *their God* works in history for the sake of his glory and on behalf of his people, Israel (2.2–20; 5.7; 6.2–15).

¹²⁶ H. Anderson, “3 Maccabees,” in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 514. Similarly, Barclay remarks that 3 Maccabees is “so evidently fictional as to render it comparatively easy to detect here the fears and aspirations of its Jewish author” (*Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 192).

¹²⁷ καὶ τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεὸν ἐγνώκότες ἀσφαλῶς ὑπερησπικότα τῶν Ιουδαίων ὡς πατέρα ὑπὲρ υἱῶν διὰ παντός συμμαχοῦντα (3 Macc 7:6).

¹²⁸ The preservation of Jewish identity is evidently of great concern to the author of 3 Maccabees (2.31–33; 3.4–7; 5.13–14; 7.10–12).

¹²⁹ Anderson, “3 Maccabees,” 514.

The Sonship Tradition in Sirach, Judith, and Psalms of Solomon

In Sirach the “Israelite sonship” metaphor combines a prayer for the eschatological restoration of Israel¹³⁰ with Israel’s designation as YHWH’s firstborn, undoubtedly drawing on Exodus 4:22 (“Israel is my firstborn son”) and Jeremiah 31:9 (“Ephraim is my firstborn”) where the designation “firstborn” (בכר/πρωτότοκος) is also used. Sirach 36:16–17 reads,

¹⁶Gather all the tribes of Jacob,

and give them their inheritance, as at the beginning.

¹⁷Have mercy, O LORD, on the people called by your name,

on Israel, whom you have named your firstborn (ὡμοίωσας ὃν πρωτόγονω).

This passage occurs as part of a passionate prayer in which the author petitions YHWH to “lift up [his] hand toward foreign nations” (Sir 36:3),¹³¹ declares that God has providentially used Israel to “show [his] holiness to them [other nations],” and asks now that he use the nations (by destroying them) to “show [his] glory to us” (Sir 36:4). Sirach 36:15–17 expresses the author’s certainty that Israel’s God will uphold his covenant with them, and that his covenant with Israel will eventually lead all nations to recognize YHWH as LORD.¹³² Within this prayer for eschatological restoration, “Israelite sonship” is functioning primarily as an expression of national identity; the “sons” are set in contrast to the other nations who are enemies of Israel. Collins calls the prayer in Sirach 36 “a highly particular judgment on the enemies of Israel.”¹³³ The elective nature of Israel’s sonship is also an undercurrent throughout this passage, as the sons

¹³⁰ Martin Hengel notes, “Ben Sira shows a considerable *political interest* in a nationalistic Jewish sense, which culminates in a completely this-worldly expectation of salvation for his people” (*Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden [London: SCM Press, 1974], 134).

¹³¹ Theophil Middendorp has argued that the prayer is not part of the original text (*Die Stellung Jesus Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus* [Leiden: Brill, 1973], 125–32). However, Johannes Marböck (‘Sir 38, 24–39, 11: Der schriftgelhrt Weise’, in *La Sagesse de l’Ancien Testament*, ed. M. Gilbert [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979], 293–316), Patrick Skehan, and Alexander A. Di Lella (*The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [ABC, Garden City: Doubleday, 1987], 418) and Georg Sauer (*Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira* [Das Alte Testament deutsch Apokryphen 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000], 249) defend the prayer as authentic.

¹³² Otto Kaiser, “Covenant and Law in Ben Sira,” in *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*, eds. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 253.

¹³³ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 110.

of Israel are described as “called” and “named” (36:17).¹³⁴ Thus the picture of “Israelite sonship” in Sirach 36 is striking because of its combination of nationalistic particularity, election, and eschatological expectation—three themes we will also encounter below in Paul’s version of Israelite sonship.

The “Israelite sonship” metaphor in Judith is fairly unmarked,¹³⁵ though it occurs in the context of a prayer laden with the language of nation and covenant. Judith’s prayer presupposes that Israel’s oppression is a theological problem that requires a response from the God of Israel to uphold his covenant promise and display his power against the enemies of Israel.¹³⁶ In her prayer, Judith prostrates herself before God and begs,

12Please, please, God of my father, God of the heritage of Israel, LORD of heaven and earth, Creator of the waters, King of all your creation, hear my prayer! 13Make my deceitful words bring wound and bruise on those who have planned cruel things against your covenant, and against your sacred house, and against Mount Zion, and against the house your sons possess. 14Let your whole nation and every tribe know and understand that you are God, the God of all power and might, and that there is no other who protects the people of Israel but you alone! (Jdt 9:12–14).

It is significant that the “Israelite sonship” metaphor occurs within the context of a prayer, as both the medium of expression, and the contents of the prayer reveal the author’s theological perspective of Israel.¹³⁷ The vocabulary in Judith’s version of an “Israelite sonship” metaphor is not striking (υἱὸν σου), but it is striking that the metaphor itself occurs in a prayer which affirms both God’s universalism as “king of all creation,” and God’s particular relationship with Israel (“God of my father,” “God of the heritage”). Though Israel’s God is God over all, Judith’s prayer does not leave room for a multiethnic view of YHWH. To be on the side of YHWH is necessarily to seek the destruction of Israel’s enemies.¹³⁸ Furthermore, Israelite sonship is explicitly linked with

134 For more on election in Ben Sira see Sigurd Grindheim, *The Crux of Election: Paul’s Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel* (WUNT 11 202, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 39.

135 Carey Moore observes, “[I]f most, or at least many, of the important ideas of Judaism exist in Judith . . . they do not seem alive and vibrant. In short, this is not one of the great prayers of the Apocrypha” (*Judith* [ABC, Garden City: Doubleday, 1985], 60).

136 John F. Craghan, “Esther, Judith, and Ruth: Paradigms for Human Liberation,” *BTB* 12 (1982): 13.

137 Moore, *Judith*, 60.

138 Craghan, “Esther, Judith, and Ruth,” 17.

God's covenant, which is also the only time "covenant" appears in the book. For Judith, Israel's sonship is undoubtedly functioning as an expression of national and ethnic identity,¹³⁹ and YHWH, as the father of Israel, is portrayed in the manner of "deity as warrior."¹⁴⁰

Given that the Psalms of Solomon, especially Psalm of Solomon 17, have been the recent subject of a considerable amount of New Testament research,¹⁴¹ and also given that there is considerable diversity of opinion in regard to its occasion and religious setting,¹⁴² attempting to address the emphasis and function of the "Israelite sonship" metaphors within the Psalms of Solomon presents us with potential difficulties. Although it would undoubtedly be helpful to the interpretive task, determining the precise occasion or setting of the document is unnecessary for elucidating, in general terms, how the Israelite sonship metaphor is being used in the text. If the purpose of the Psalms of Solomon is to respond to a crisis situation,¹⁴³ and was written to spur the Jewish community toward faithfulness to their God,¹⁴⁴ then part of the task here is to examine how the "Israelite sonship" metaphors might reflect this mindset and contribute to this task.

139 Benedikt Eckhardt points out that in Judith, "Israel" appears 50 times, suggesting that "Judith accumulates ethnically based vocabulary to mark identity and alterity" ("Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonean Politics," *JSP* 18 (2009): 257–58.

140 Linda Day, "Faith, Character, and Perspective in Judith," *JOT* 95 (2001): 80. For more on Judith's character and the character of Judith's God see *ibid.*, 73–91.

141 See especially Mikael Winnige, *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters* (ConBNT 26, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiskell, 1995); For a summary and critique of Psalms of Solomon research in New Testament studies see Brad Embry, "The *Psalms of Solomon* and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation," *JSP* 13 (2002): 99–136.

142 For an overview of the positions regarding the setting and community of the document see Robert B. Wright, *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition* (Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1), New York: T & T Clark, 2007, 1–12; Joseph Trafton, "Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research," *JSP* 6 (1994): 7–8. Charlesworth, in an editorial comment at the end of Wright's introduction in *OTP* remarks, "It is unwise to label these psalms as either Pharisaic or Essene. . . . The recognition that some ideas in these psalms are similar to those among the Pharisees or among the Essenes ignores the fact that these two sects were very similar . . . [and] most Jews were not members of a sect . . . hence it is unwise to force these psalms into a model of the Pharisees or Essenes" ("Psalms of Solomon," 642).

143 See Robert B. Wright, and V. Schwartz, "Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance," in *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983), 643.

144 Embry, "The *Psalms of Solomon*," 135.

Both examples of “Israelite sonship” metaphors in the Psalms of Solomon contain nationalistic undertones, although the nationalism in Psalms of Solomon is combined with the insistence that a restored nation of Israel will be comprised only of the righteous (e.g., 3.11–12; 13.9–12; 15.10–13; 17.26–32; 18.5). The “Israelite sonship” metaphors look forward to this future restoration of Israel, which rests on the hope that Israel is the chosen nation of YHWH, with whom he will uphold his everlasting covenant.¹⁴⁵ In addition to some of the themes we have seen in other texts, the “Israelite sonship” metaphor in Psalm of Solomon 17.26–29 contains the added element of a Messiah.¹⁴⁶ The text reads:

He will gather a holy people whom he will lead in righteousness; and he will judge the tribes of the people that have been made holy by the LORD their God. He will not tolerate unrighteousness (even) to pause among them, and any person who knows wickedness shall not live with them. For he shall know them that they are all sons of their God (γνώσεται γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὅτι πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν). He will distribute them upon the land according to their tribes; the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them.

In this text, the focus is on the Messiah-figure gathering and restoring the righteous of Israel. This Psalm is interesting because although the author uses “sons of their God” as a designation for the Israelites, he also assumes that YHWH and his Messiah will only deliver those Israelites who are righteous. The author contrasts the “sons” (17.27) or a “holy people” (17.26) with “sinners . . . to whom you did not make the promise,” who from the context of the Psalm are most

¹⁴⁵ Wright and Schwartz, “Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance,” 644.

¹⁴⁶ By using the term “Messiah” here I am by no means making a claim that the Messiah in this text, or other pseudepigraphal texts, is entirely synonymous with the New Testament’s portrayal of Jesus as the Messiah. Indeed, my point is to highlight the differences in the treatment of both Israelites and the Messiah between the author of the Psalms of Solomon who continues to use “firstborn son” to refer to Israel in a text with a Messiah-figure, and Paul who reserves “firstborn” for Christ as Messiah, and uses υἱοθεσία to designate Israel’s sonship. For an overview of the diversity of messianic beliefs in early Judaism see William Horbury, “Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day (JSOTSup 270, Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 402–433; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995); James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

likely the Hasmonean usurpers.¹⁴⁷ These “sinners” are contrasted with “the lawless one” who “did in Jerusalem all the things that gentiles do for their gods in their cities” (17.14).¹⁴⁸ Rather than sonship being automatically extended to ethnic Israel, in this passage “sonship” is reserved for the righteous and holy Israelites. Moreover, the Messiah takes action against both the Judean “sinners” and the gentiles. The Son of David “will smash the arrogance of sinners” (17.23), and “purge Jerusalem of the gentiles” (17.22), and “there will be no unrighteous among [the righteous] in those days” (17.32).¹⁴⁹ We see in the author’s use of the metaphor that “Israelite sonship” belongs to the more narrowly defined group of righteous Israelites.¹⁵⁰ However, it must also be noted that the designation “sons of their God” (υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν) is still restricted to a select group of ethnic Israelites—that is, the text does not indicate that sonship is extended to any non-Jews who are “righteous” (see esp. 17.28–30, 44–45). As Wright remarks, “The writer is no universalist. . . . No hope is offered for [gentile] conversion.”¹⁵¹ Indeed, one of the blessings for the righteous Israelites is that “the alien and the foreigner will no longer live near them” (17.29).

Psalm of Solomon 18 uses an Israelite sonship metaphor that paraphrases and elaborates on Deuteronomy 8:5 and Proverbs 3:12. In Psalm of Solomon 18.4–5 the psalmist states,

Your discipline for us (is) as (for) a firstborn son, an only child, to divert the perceptive person from unintentional sins. May God cleanse Israel for the day of mercy in blessing, for the appointed day when his Messiah will reign (18.4–5).

147 See Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” 641–42.

148 Most identify “the lawless one” as Pompey (see Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” 641; Robert Hann, “The Community of the Pious: the Social Setting of the *Psalms of Solomon*,” *SR* 17 (1988): 172, however Kenneth Atkinson argues that Pss. Sol. 17 was redacted by a later sect and instead refers to Herod (“On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalm of Solomon* 17,” *JBL* 118.3 [1999]: 435–60).

149 This does not necessarily mean that the author views sonship as contingent upon righteous behavior, although we see that the “sinners” arise because of the “sins” of Israel. However, the “sins” mentioned in 17:5 presumably do not disqualify the “sons” from their sonship. Later the sons are restored to Jerusalem while the Psalmist pleads with YHWH to “drive out the sinners from the inheritance” (17:23).

150 The restriction of sonship to “the righteous” does not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the Psalms of Solomon is a sectarian document; see Jerry O’Dell, “The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts),” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 252.

151 Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” 645.

As in the previous example, the “Israelite sonship” metaphor here looks forward to the day of Israel’s cleansing and restoration, but it combines this expectation with an interpretation of the present sufferings of the righteous. In this text, the discipline metaphor is the key to understanding the author’s viewpoint regarding God’s action toward Israel. Here YHWH’s divine discipline functions to purge Israel of not only unrighteousness, but also the unrighteous.¹⁵² Furthermore, the vocabulary of this example is fascinating to consider. In this text Israel is not only God’s firstborn son (υἱὸς πρωτότοκος) but an only child (μονογενής). The addition of μονογενής alone represents an interesting development in the “Israelite sonship” metaphor tradition, but even more significant for our purposes is that both πρωτότοκος and μονογενής appear as designations for Israel in a Messianic text. Although the Psalms of Solomon contain a highly developed example of a Messianic figure, the author maintains “firstborn” and “only child” as designations for Israel. These two designations (πρωτότοκος and μονογενής) are reserved for Christ alone in the writings of the New Testament (e.g., Rom 8:29; Col 1:15, 18; Heb 1:6; Rev 1:5; John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18; 1 John 4:9), while Paul opts instead for υἱοθεσία as an expression of Israel’s sonship.¹⁵³

Some Conclusions on the Sonship Metaphor

Given the diversity of the texts and their various settings and themes just surveyed, it seems almost futile to attempt any systemization of the “Israelite sonship” metaphor from these texts. Indeed, it is not in the nature of metaphors to be systematized. However, in order to proceed with a comparison of these metaphors with the Pauline use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, I will attempt to draw some broad conclusions about “Israelite sonship” metaphors in other Jewish texts. First, we have seen in all of the examples that Israel is designated as either “son,” “firstborn,” or once as “only child,” or its people are “sons” of YHWH. The vocabulary of “adoption” (εἰσποιεῖν, ἐκποιεῖν, τίθεσθαι, ποιεῖσθαι, υἱοποιεῖσθαι, υἱοθετεῖν) does not appear in the LXX either in the Old Testament literature or in the intertestamental sources.¹⁵⁴ If υἱοθεσία were a mundane

152 Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 50–51.

153 More will be said about these designations below.

154 One could possibly argue that the “concept” of adoption is present even if the vocabulary for adoption is not (e.g., James Scott, *Adoption as Sons*). However, it is equally arguable that those who see the concept present without the vocabulary anachronistically read the concept “adoption” back into the text where it may not have been originally present. As I have argued in my chapters on methodology, the vehicle of a metaphor evokes a specific set of associations, and vehicles are not wholly interchangeable (see chapters 2 and 3). Thus, I maintain that the concept of υἱοθεσία cannot be present in these texts without the

way of articulating the status of the Israelites, then the vocabulary of adoption would be expected to appear in at least some of the intertestamental literature. Since the vocabulary of adoption does not appear in any of the other examples, we cannot assume that these texts provide a straightforward link to Paul's use of υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4. Rather, moving forward we must consider how Paul's metaphor interacts with and interprets other "Israelite sonship" metaphors from this tradition.

I have shown that some of the sonship metaphors in both Old Testament and intertestamental texts function as a familial description of YHWH's covenant relationship with Israel (e.g., Exod 4:22; Jer 31:7–10; Hos 1:6–2:1; Wis 12:19–22; 3 Macc 7.6; Pss. Sol. 18.1–4). In most cases YHWH acts on behalf of his sons, disciplining them in order to show them mercy, and bringing them to repentance and restoration (e.g., Deut 8:5; 32:5–6; Isa 30:1–11; Wis 12:19–22; Pss. Sol. 18.4), though this action does not preclude the possibility of YHWH turning his back on the Israelites for a time (e.g., Jer 31:7–10; Hos 1:6–2:1 [1:10]). YHWH's actions toward other nations are often punitive, both for the unrighteous behavior of these nations and on occasion, specifically for their treatment of Israel as the chosen son of YHWH (e.g., Wis 12:19–22; see also Wis 18:1–4; Jdt 9:12–14). The designations of "son" and "sons" did not exclude the possibility that there were some among the Israelites who did not receive the blessing of sonship (see esp. Pss. Sol. 17.26–29). Furthermore, in texts that designate the collective Israel as "son" it seems that the collective designation does not preclude the possibility that some individuals within the collective will experience judgment, and possibly forfeit the benefit of sonship (e.g., Jer 31:7–10; Pss. Sol. 18.1–4; see also Pss. Sol. 17.26–29). There is a strong component of nationalism and exclusivity in many of the occurrences of the sonship metaphor, where Israel is set in a dichotomous relationship with other nations (e.g., Deut 32:5–9; Wis 12:19–22; Jos. Asen. 19.8; 21.4; Pss. Sol. 18.1–4). In light of the analysis above, it seems reasonable to conclude that in most contexts, the designation of "sonship" is an affirmation of Israel's unique identity as the people of YHWH and is closely linked to ethnicity and national identity.

Paul's "Reflection" of the Sonship Tradition

Having broadly traced the contours of the landscape of texts containing Israelite sonship metaphors I will now consider how Paul's text interacts in intertextual relationships with these precursory texts. Here we must bear in mind that the purpose in surveying the previous texts was not to trace the "sources"

vehicle υἱοθεσία (or another word from the same semantic domain of adoption) also being present.

of or “influences” on Paul’s metaphor but rather to sketch the tradition that Paul draws upon and intentionally “distorts in order to interpret.”¹⁵⁵ To use Brawley’s terminology, I will show in the analysis below that although Paul’s metaphor speaks in harmony with some of the themes found in other sonship metaphors, he reinterprets and appropriates these themes in important ways to suit his context. The theme may remain, but its transposition into the Pauline text results in marked differences in the meaning of Israelite sonship. Furthermore, because Paul employs an image—*υιοθεσία*—which does not occur in other Jewish texts, there are elements of discord that arise when the Pauline image collides with images from precursor texts in the intertextual space.

The intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and the other texts we examined is simultaneously diachronic and synchronic. Moreover, the diachronic relationship is bidirectional. Paul has not only incorporated and transposed elements from previous texts in order to create a new figuration in Romans 9, but also his new figuration might cause his readers to reinterpret other texts containing Israelite sonship metaphors retrospectively. This seems to me to be a particularly salient feature of intertextual relationships within Scripture, and indeed a feature that both Old and New Testament authors employ with a good deal of self-awareness and creativity in order to appropriate texts to new situations. I propose that Paul’s change in image reverberates powerfully through the intertextual landscape, reinterpreting Israel’s sonship through his unique variation on the theme.

It bears repeating that the Pauline image “adoption to sonship (*υιοθεσία*),” is a different image than “son” (*υἱός*) “sons” (*υἱοί*) and “firstborn” (*πρωτότοκος*) which we saw in the texts above; these are all certainly related images, but they are not identical. I argued in previous chapters that metaphors are not necessarily interchangeable even when they utilize the same vehicle (e.g., Gal 5:7; 1 Cor 9:24–26, and Rom 9:16 and *τρέχειν*),¹⁵⁶ and Paul’s metaphor in Romans 9:4, which uses an entirely different vehicle (*υιοθεσία*), produces some elements that are in discord with other expressions of Israelite sonship that we have seen in other texts. However, despite the difference in vocabulary between Romans 9:4 and the other Israelite sonship texts, Paul’s metaphor speaks in harmony with several aspects of the other metaphors examined above: (1) as an affirmation of Israel’s particularity, (2) as a description of Israel’s covenant relationship with YHWH and (3) as a confirmation of God’s election of

155 John Hollander, *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), ix.

156 See chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of a metaphor’s vehicle and meaning.

Israel. Paul's metaphor also contributes elements that are unique and novel—elements that speak back to other texts in the tradition and provide a new framework for reading them. First, in Romans 9:4 υἱοθεσία negates any sense of sonship being an *exclusive* privilege of the Israelites. If the Israelites can be adopted, then others (i.e., gentiles) can also receive sonship through adoption, which is not true of other vehicles for sonship, such as πρωτότοκος (firstborn) or μονογενής (only child). Second, despite Paul's affirmation of Israel's covenant relationship, υἱοθεσία provides a noticeably different schema from “firstborn,” which appears in several other versions of sonship metaphors (e.g., Exod 4:22; Jer 31:9; Sir 36:16–17; Pss. Sol. 18.1–4), but which Paul reserves for Christ alone (Rom 8:29). Third, since the elective component of Israel's sonship is highlighted, υἱοθεσία decisively undercuts any hint of “naturalness” present in passages where terms like πρωτότοκος (firstborn) or μονογενής (only child) appear. These unique elements brought by Paul's innovative use of υἱοθεσία work with the recontextualized themes from the other Israelite sonship texts to produce Paul's unique “reflection” of Israelite sonship, and the combination of these elements will be examined in detail below. The complexity of the intertextual relationships evoked by the Pauline metaphor demonstrates Hays' assertion that “texts are not inert; they burn and throw fragments of flame on their rising heat.”¹⁵⁷ Below I will show that Paul's choice of υἱοθεσία has several potentially volatile implications both for his text and for the texts he has transposed. In choosing υἱοθεσία Paul becomes an interpreter and innovator of the sonship tradition.

The most obvious parallel between Paul's designation in Romans 9:4 and the Old Testament and intertestamental texts examined above is simply that Paul also counts sonship as a privilege of ethnic Israel.¹⁵⁸ In doing so, he affirms the particularity of YHWH's relationship with the Israel as the original recipients of the privilege of sonship and the other privileges he lists. As Michael Cranford remarks, “If a Jew cannot depend on his or her ethnicity, then what does this say about God's promises to ethnic Israel?”¹⁵⁹ Indeed, it is precisely the particularity of God's promises *to Israel* that causes Paul his anguish (Rom 9:2), and arguably necessitates the whole of Paul's discourse in Romans 9–11.

However, particularity for Paul apparently does not imply the exclusivity that is found in some of the texts examined above. Although Paul must wrestle with how God's particular relationship with the Israelites fits with the inclusion

¹⁵⁷ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 33.

¹⁵⁸ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 545.

¹⁵⁹ Cranford, “Election and Ethnicity,” 28.

of the gentiles, it is clear that Paul sees the possibility of Jews and gentiles coexisting as “sons” (e.g., Romans 8:15, 23). Since Paul has already used υιοθεσία to refer to the adoption to sonship of believers in Christ, be they Jew or gentile, twice in the previous chapter (8:15, 23),¹⁶⁰ it cannot be an exclusive privilege of the Israelites any longer. Thus when Paul ascribes υιοθεσία to Israel in Romans 9:4, it sits alongside the υιοθεσία of believers in Romans 8. It seems then, that despite Paul’s affirmation of Israel’s particularity through the υιοθεσία metaphor, the concept of particularity has been reworked in light of Paul’s adamant inclusion of the gentiles in God’s plan of salvation. Paul must show that YHWH, Israel’s God who chose Israel and promised his covenant faithfulness to Israel is the same God who now has made salvation available to all who believe in Israel’s Messiah.¹⁶¹ As a concept, υιοθεσία is well suited to the reworking of Israel’s particularity; it enables Paul to stress Israel’s status as “sons” without employing terms like πρωτότοκος (firstborn) or μονογενής (only child) that by nature would exclude others from sharing these labels, or would elevate Israel over the gentiles in the hierarchy of birth order. While Paul can use υιοθεσία to affirm Israel’s particularity as God’s covenant people, the repetition of the term, which is also used in 8:15 and 23, in 9:4 alerts the reader that the boundaries of God’s covenant people have been extended. Where there can be only one “firstborn” or “only child,” (e.g., Exod 4:22; Jer 31:7–10; Sir 36:16–17; Pss. Sol. 18.1–4), υιοθεσία does not preclude the possibility of other sons.

Furthermore, whereas several of the texts which utilize sonship metaphors emphasize the preeminence of Israel in conjunction with the nation’s particularity as the “firstborn” of YHWH, Paul’s use of υιοθεσία appears as a term of contrast to the sonship of Christ, whom Paul describes as πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς (firstborn among many brothers and sisters) just a few verses earlier (Rom 8:29). For Paul to label Christ rather than Israel as πρωτότοκος (firstborn) and then to ascribe adoptive sonship to Israel represents a significant deviation from other expressions of the sonship metaphor (e.g., Exod 4:22; Jer 31:9; Wis 18:13; Sir 36:17; 2 Esd 6:58; Pss. Sol. 13.9; 18.4). It is not surprising

160 This has led some scholars to conclude that υιοθεσία in Rom 9:4 is of a fundamentally different character than υιοθεσία in Rom 8:15, 23 (e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. 2, 461; Moo, *Romans*, 561; Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 5). However, I would suggest rather than υιοθεσία “decreasing” in significance to a kind of “proto-adoption,” we, in fact, have Paul reinterpreting the historic designations of Israelite sonship in a way that underscores God’s elective purposes and mercy towards Israel by drawing attention to God’s divine act of making sons by adoption, which he does for the sake of both Israel and the gentiles who will also receive sonship through adoption.

161 Moo, *Romans*, 550.

that the Pauline emphasis is clearly on the preeminence of Christ as firstborn, indeed this designation evokes its own set of intertextual relationships to texts where the Davidic Messiah is designated the “firstborn” (e.g., Ps 89:27). However, in the Old Testament the designation of the Davidide as “firstborn” and Israel as “firstborn” stand side by side. Here in Romans 8–9 Christ stands alone as the “firstborn,” confirming his identity as the Messiah of Israel, and Israel’s sonship is described using the same term Paul uses of gentiles only a few verses earlier. Paul, in using υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4, affirms the ongoing sonship of Israel while removing the element of preeminence found in other Israelite sonship texts where more exclusionary labels are used.¹⁶² In addition, although most instances of υἱοθεσία would result in a son achieving the status of “firstborn,”¹⁶³ Paul’s innovative use of the metaphor sets the adoptive sonship of both believers and Israel under the preeminent sonship of the firstborn, Christ.

A second commonality that we see between Paul’s υἱοθεσία metaphor and some other “Israelite sonship” metaphors is the use of the metaphor to portray aspects of the covenantal relationship between God and his people (e.g., familial intimacy, God’s faithfulness, God’s discipline, or Israel’s disobedience). However, Paul’s concept of the covenant relationship expressed in his “Israelite sonship” metaphor, and his subsequent development of “sonship” as a motif, do not have precise parallels to the covenant relationship depicted in any of the texts examined above. Moreover, in combination with its covenantal emphasis, Paul’s choice to use υἱοθεσία is uniquely capable of highlighting a third commonality: the *absolute elective nature of sonship* due to God’s sovereign choice. While it is true that other iterations of Israelite sonship metaphors strongly emphasize Israel’s election,¹⁶⁴ election is inherent in υἱοθεσία in a way that it is not inherent in πρωτότοκος (firstborn) or μονογενής (only child). According to Paul, in God’s economy sons are made, not born. Thus by evoking and yet reinterpreting other Israelite sonship metaphors, Paul subtly contrasts the sonship that is achieved by adoption (υἱοθεσία) and the “natural” sonship that is implied in terms like πρωτότοκος (firstborn) or μονογενής (only child). Moreover, that Paul has already designated Jesus as πρωτότοκος (firstborn) further emphasizes that he has conscientiously chosen υἱοθεσία as the designation for Israel’s sonship. As Paul’s argument in Romans 9 develops, his use of

162 I would argue that Paul’s use of υἱοθεσία as the designation of sonship for both Jews and gentiles also strongly suggests that the priority of Israel (e.g., Rom 1:16) in Romans is predominantly a temporal priority rather than a ranking of people groups.

163 See e.g., the connection between adoption and inheritance discussed in chapter 4.

164 See Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 7–76, for an analysis of Jewish understandings of election found in the Old Testament literature and Second Temple Judaism.

υιοθεσία as a description of Israel's ongoing covenant relationship with YHWH, and the motif of Israel's sonship, are interwoven with the sonship of the elect among Jews *and gentiles* (e.g., Rom 9:24).¹⁶⁵

Paul nuances his version of Israel's sonship and covenant relationship primarily through incorporation and reinterpretation of examples from the Old Testament, centering especially on the transformation of the word "son" (e.g., Rom 9:9; 9:24–28). Paul reinterprets "son" primarily through the interplay of changing referents. This is evident first in Paul's analogy between Israel and Abraham (Rom 9:6) where Paul distinguishes between Abraham's children (τέκνα) versus his "seed" (σπέρμα), and culminates in Paul's affirmation that the promise has said "Sarah will have a son" (ἔσται τῇ Σάρρᾳ υἱός) (Rom 9:9). From the outset, Israel's election was not in terms of biological lineage or natural descent, but instead was from its inception sustained by YHWH's promise and faith.¹⁶⁶ Thus, Paul brings out what is latent in the text in Genesis, that contrary to normal human experience, sonship of YHWH is granted rather than naturally obtained or inherited. Paul's coupling of the promise and sonship in Romans 9:6–9 further underscores his emphasis on the elective and covenantal nature of Israel's adoptive sonship in Romans 9:4.¹⁶⁷

Paul develops the elective quality of Israel's sonship further in his example of Jacob and Esau, where Jacob is chosen "so that God's purpose of election might remain" (ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένῃ) (Rom 9:11). Schreiner rightly remarks, "The combination of words underscores in the strongest possible terms that the fulfillment of the promise was based on God's electing purpose and intention."¹⁶⁸ As the argument of Romans 9 unfolds further, it becomes evident that Israel's election to sonship works to uphold God's covenant faithfulness and to show mercy (Rom 9:16).¹⁶⁹

165 The closest intertextual connection to the Pauline relationship between sonship and election might be Pss. Sol. 17:26–32 where the "sons" are only the righteous in Israel. See above for a fuller discussion of this text.

166 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 548.

167 Epp, "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul," 89.

168 Schreiner, *Romans*, 500. However, Schreiner's insistence that "[Paul's] failure to insert human faith as the decisive and ultimate basis for God's election indicates that God's call and election are prior to and the ground of human faith" (ibid.) inserts the topic of individual faith and response into a discussion of God's promises to corporate Israel where such an insertion is unwarranted. For a detailed critique of Schreiner, see Brian Abasciano, "Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Tom Schreiner," *JETS* 49 (2006): 363–64.

169 Abasciano observes, "Romans 9:11–12 does not actually seek to make a point about election *per se*, but uses the example of God's election of Jacob . . . to make a statement about God's *purpose* in election" ("Corporate Election in Romans 9," 363 [emph. orig.]).

The elective and covenantal character of υἱοθεσία is then reaffirmed later in the chapter when Paul quotes from Hosea in Romans 9:24–28,¹⁷⁰ wherein both Jews and gentiles are designated “sons of the living God (υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος).” Though Paul’s designation of “sons” is also found in the LXX (ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος) and the MT of Hosea 2:1 (יִאמַר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים), Paul’s use of the quotation in Romans 9:26 substantially changes the sense of the original. Indeed, Moo labels this quotation as “a potentially more serious instance of what seems to be arbitrary hermeneutics on Paul’s part.”¹⁷¹ The original setting of the quotation clearly designates the people of Israel as the referent for both “not my people” and “sons of the living God,” pointing to their anticipated restoration following the judgment Hosea has prophesied (Hos 1:1–2:1; 2:21–23). However, Moo’s conclusion that “this text reflects a hermeneutical supposition . . . that OT predictions of a renewed Israel find their fulfillment in the church” might miss the point of Paul’s subtle redefinition of sonship. Rather than introducing a “church/Israel” dichotomy into the text, Paul’s main point is about *sonship itself*—namely, that sonship is extended through election to both Jews and gentiles to show God’s mercy.¹⁷² In Romans 9:24–28, in light of his own understanding of his mission to the gentiles, Paul audaciously writes the gentiles into the story of Israel by reappropriating words that Hosea spoke concerning the redemption of Israel.¹⁷³ Thus Paul’s use of the sonship motif in Hosea 2:1 (1:10) at once affirms that sonship is an expression of a covenant relationship with the Living God (either for Israelites [e.g., Rom 9:4] or for Jews and gentiles [e.g., Rom 9:24]), and also that this covenant relationship, while being the privilege of the Israelites, is no longer restricted to Israel. The covenantal nature of sonship remains, the promise to Israel remains, but the exclusivity of

170 Paul’s quotation of Hosea 2:25 (MT 2:23) in verse 25 does not precisely match any known manuscript of the text. It is likely that Paul changes ἐλέησω (LXX) to καλέσω to maintain his theme of “calling,” but it is unclear what motivated him to abandon Hosea’s text (τὴν οὐκ ἠλεημένην) and reverse the order of the clauses. Dunn argues that Paul added καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην “[i]n view of the prominence of ἀγαπᾶν in Hosea . . . and he may even have intended it to sum up the whole message of Hosea” (*Romans*, vol. 2, 571).

171 Moo, *Romans*, 613.

172 On the theme of mercy binding together the whole of Romans 9–11 see Michael Theobald, “Unterschiedliche Gottesbilder in Röm 9–11? Die Israel-Kapitel als Anfrage an die Einheit des theologischen Diskurses bei Paulus,” in *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 176–77.

173 J. Ross Wagner, “Not from the Jews Only, But Also from the Gentiles: Mercy to the Nations in Romans 9–11,” in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 422.

Israel's sonship is emptied from the original settings of the texts as Paul's argument unfolds through chapter 9.¹⁷⁴

Paul's innovative use of Hosea 2:1 (1:10) is particularly interesting when it is set alongside his use of Isaiah 10:22 in Romans 9:27–28. In Isaiah 10:22 the Israelites are referred to as “your people” in the text of the MT (עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל) and simply as “the people” in the LXX (ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ). Paul's version, “the sons of Israel” (τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ), either quotes from a tradition that contained “sons” rather than “people,” or Paul changed the attested tradition and emended the text himself.¹⁷⁵ In any case, Paul presumably chooses to include “sons” rather than “people” in his version of the text of Isaiah.¹⁷⁶ This emendation to Isaiah suggests that his development of the sonship motif, beginning with υἱοθεσία in Romans 9:4 and continuing throughout the chapter, is both intentional and strategic, as Paul re-inscribes and repurposes Old Testament texts to redefine the boundaries of sonship of YHWH. Taken together with Paul's statement in Romans 9:6 that “not all Israel is Israel,” we see in Romans 9:27–28 that not all “sons” are really “sons,” but rather only the remnant will be saved.¹⁷⁷ For Paul, the remnant is proof that YHWH has not rejected his people Israel, and that he remains faithful to his promises. In Paul, the remnant reinforces that sonship is based solely on the mercy and grace of God, and through the remnant YHWH's promises are preserved for the restored Israel in the eschaton (Rom 11:26). Thus we see that in the course of Paul's argument, all of God's sons, whether Jew or gentile, receive the privilege because of God's election. When coupled with his use of Hosea 2:1, Paul's use of Isaiah 10:22 further highlights the elective and covenantal nature of the Pauline concept of sonship.

One final observation regarding Paul's unique “reflection” of Israelite sonship is that his terminology in Romans 9:4 entirely removes the “naturalness”

174 More will be said about Paul's reinterpretation of exclusivity in the discussion below on metaphor and perception.

175 Paul's text is more likely an amalgamation of Hos 2:1 and Isa 10:22–23. See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 572–73; Jewett, *Romans*, 601–603, for a detailed comparative analysis of these texts.

176 I prefer to think that Paul has intentionally included “sons” as a positive link both to the immediate context of his quotation of Hosea (so Jewett, *Romans*, 602) and also to his development of the sonship motif throughout Romans 9, rather than to think that Paul's change was motivated by his reluctance to quote the original wording from Isaiah (עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל) because it would have contradicted his claim in 9:25 (so Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986), 168.

177 For an analysis of who exactly constitutes the remnant vis-à-vis Rom 9:6 see Longenecker, “Different Answers to Different Issues,” 96–107; Eastman, “Israel and the Mercy of God,” 383–85; Jüncker, “Children of Promise,” 148–60.

normally associated with sonship from consideration. Both *πρωτότοκος* (firstborn) and *μονογενής* (only child) suggest, and in cases of metaphorical predication, draw upon “natural” or biological lineage where they are unqualified by a vocabulary of adoption (e.g., Exod 4:22; Pss. Sol. 18.4–5). While it is by no means the case that all Jews thought of Israel as the “natural” son of YHWH, it will not do to label a metaphorical predication of *πρωτότοκος* (firstborn) and *μονογενής* (only child) an instance of “adoption” as a literal paraphrase.¹⁷⁸ Indeed, labeling texts where *πρωτότοκος* (firstborn) and *μονογενής* (only child) occur as the “adoption” of Israel only muddies the waters for analyzing Paul’s metaphor of adoption in Romans 9:4, which uses decidedly different vocabulary. Rather, Paul’s choice to use *υιοθεσία* to describe Israel’s sonship provided him with a much straighter path to affirming the sonship of those beyond the ethnic community of the Israelites than terms like *πρωτότοκος* (firstborn) and *μονογενής* (only child), which do not lend themselves to such an affordance. Moreover, with any element of “naturalness” excluded from consideration, God’s sovereign choice and plan of election comes to the fore. Paul’s argument seems to be that if sonship is entirely elective, then it cannot also be the exclusive privilege of one ethnic group, as God elects from both Jew and gentile (e.g., Rom 9:24; 11:28–32). The emphasis *υιοθεσία* places on election provides Paul with an ideal platform to develop his argument that “it is not as though the word of God has failed,” which unfolds throughout the course of Romans 9–11.

When we look closely at Paul’s use of *υιοθεσία* and his development of the sonship motif throughout Romans 9 we must recognize that in some regards it sings in harmony with other similar metaphors in the Old Testament and intertestamental literature, but it does not sing in unison. Indeed there is some internal instability to the development of the motif in the course of Paul’s argument, as the referent for “sons” and “children” changes a number of times.¹⁷⁹ For Paul, “adoption to sonship” (*υιοθεσία*) is esteemed as a privilege of ethnic Israelites (9:4), it is an expression of God’s covenant relationship with his people (who are no longer exclusively Israelites [9:25–28]), and this covenant relationship is maintained by God’s elective purposes in order for God to show mercy (9:11–18). Furthermore, Paul does not seem to see a conflict between his designation of *υιοθεσία* as a privilege to the Israelites and only a remnant of

178 For more on the problem of mixed metaphors see chapter 2.

179 In 9:4 *υιοθεσία* refers to ethnic Israelites; in 9:7–9 Paul introduces a distinction between *τέκνα* and *σπέρμα* with only the children of the promise counted as descendants; in 9:26 the gentiles are clearly the referent of “sons of the living God,” but in 9:27 “son” is once again used in reference to the ethnic Israelites.

Israel receiving the benefit of sonship (9:27).¹⁸⁰ Indeed for Paul, the preservation of a remnant is evidence that God has not rejected his people (9:27–29; 11:1–6; 28–29), despite the fact that not all of the Israelites enjoy the benefits of sonship (11:7).

When the Pauline metaphor of υἰοθεσία is alongside other metaphors in the sonship tradition, from the more generic υἱοὶ θεοῦ (sons of God) to more specific terms like πρωτότοκος (firstborn) and μονογενής (only child), then the range of diverse implications each metaphor has the potential to produce becomes more visible. Moreover, interpreters of the Pauline metaphor must recognize that Paul uses υἰοθεσία in a unique and innovative way, and by doing so he cuts against the grain of the sonship tradition which itself had a well-established and recognizable vocabulary of terms used in its other iterations. It is not, then, enough to treat other texts in the sonship tradition as “the background” for the Pauline metaphor. Interpreters must also consider how Paul’s language of υἰοθεσία speaks back to these texts, acting as his “reflection” that provides his set of constraints on the character and nature of Israel’s sonship. In its “reflecting” role, υἰοθεσία constrains and reinterprets other texts in the sonship tradition to emphasize YHWH’s election of Israel and the gracious nature of Israel’s sonship. Paul provides a distinct view of Israel’s sonship that maintains the emphasis on God’s particular covenantal relationship with Israel while simultaneously extending the possibility of sonship to gentiles. Paul’s “reflection” of υἰοθεσία, by emphasizing the election of God rather than the preeminence of Israel, lends itself easily to God’s election of non-Israelite sons that is visible later in Paul’s argument (Rom 9:24–26).

Metaphor and Audience

The previous two sections have examined and identified the features of Paul’s υἰοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 that pertain to texts and connections between texts. This final section will move beyond the confines of the text and undertake an examination of the cognitive and affective potential of Paul’s metaphor in its setting in Romans 9:4. Here I will examine the potential “intercourse of thoughts” Paul’s audience members might experience when they encounter his description of Israel as sons by adoption. It is important to acknowledge

¹⁸⁰ This idea is also present in Pss. Sol. 17, and one could argue that it is present in Jer 31:7–10, but see Heaton, “The Root ῥίζα and the Doctrine of the Remnant,” 29, for the compelling case that the Pauline concept of a remnant deviates significantly from its Old Testament origins.

that the analysis below necessarily deals in potentialities rather than absolutes, particularly in this case since Paul does not elaborate in detail about the significance he intends by designating *υιοθεσία* as a privilege to Israel. The lack of explanation leaves a much wider cognitive gap for his audience members to fill than in occurrences of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors where Paul has chosen to elaborate in greater detail on the metaphors' significance.¹⁸¹

However, recognizing that one can only propose a *possible understanding* (or understandings) of the metaphor's cognitive and affective properties does not mean that there is not tremendous benefit here in considering the possibilities. If we grant, as I argued in chapter three, that metaphors are inherently performative utterances and that they actively create a framework of perception for their hearers, then any exegesis of metaphor *must seek to elucidate and outline this framework*. This is true even if the precise framework cannot be absolutely delineated for every hearer of Paul's metaphor. In regard to the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 9:4, it is particularly important to bear in mind Turner's argument that "[h]uman language relies on common mental systems shared by members of a linguistic community. It relies on shared basic metaphors, idealized cognitive models, and metaphoric inferences."¹⁸² According to Turner, members of a linguistic community (in our case, Paul's audience) are likely to share similar cognitive frameworks because they are likely to respond to Paul's metaphor in similar ways. Thus in the following analysis I will base my construction of the cognitive framework on elements that will be shown to be part of the audience's "common ground."¹⁸³

Metaphor and Perception

Recall that metaphors primarily influence the perception of their hearers/readers by providing a cognitive structure through which hearers perceive the metaphor's subject (tenor) and also by highlighting and hiding certain features of the tenor.¹⁸⁴ I have already noted that Paul's use of *υιοθεσία* as a metaphorical description of God's relationship with Israel is unparalleled by any other

181 Of this phenomenon Black reasons, "The extended meanings that result, the relations between initially disparate realms created, can neither be antecedently predicted nor subsequently paraphrased in prose. We can comment *upon* the metaphor, but the metaphor itself neither needs nor invites explanation and paraphrase" (*Models and Metaphors*, 236–37).

182 Turner, *Death is the Mother of Beauty*, 114.

183 Clark, *Using Language*, 100–112.

184 Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 139; Gareth Morgan, *Images of Organizations*, 2nd ed (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 4.

source in Jewish literature, making it particularly important to consider the potential framework of perception it created for Paul's audience and what aspects of Israel's relationship with God are highlighted and hidden in Paul's metaphorical description of υιοθεσία. As I have argued previously, metaphors are not neutral conduits of information, but rather they are active agents in structuring the cognitive framework of their hearers.¹⁸⁵ In this context, Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor provides his hearers with a particular way of thinking about Israel's relationship with God, and it is important to recognize that this framework is not *the only framework* for understanding their relationship.¹⁸⁶ Indeed, Paul uses numerous metaphorical descriptions of Israel during the course of Romans 9–11,¹⁸⁷ each providing its own cognitive framework for the audience. Thus, if we can recognize from the outset that Paul's metaphor is not merely a description, but rather an *active agent* that structures the cognitive framework, then we can also better appreciate its distinctive elements.

Outlining the Cognitive Framework of Israel's Adoption to Sonship
Delineating the cognitive framework Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor provides in Romans 9:4 is perhaps the most straightforward component of our current task. The cognitive structure the metaphor creates is closely related to the metaphor's tenor, which in this case is Israel's relationship with God, and its vehicle, which in this case is υιοθεσία.¹⁸⁸ These two elements in the text lead to the "intercourse of thoughts," which evokes the cognitive structure of υιοθεσία through which Paul's audience perceives Israel's relationship to YHWH in Romans 9:4. As described earlier in the discussion of the metaphor's possible underlying models, υιοθεσία always denotes "adoption," which means that the cognitive framework through which Paul's audience views Israel's relationship with God here is "adopted sonship."¹⁸⁹ This cognitive framework creates several key perceptions for Paul's hearers that will be integral to his argument as it unfolds in Romans 9–11: (1) υιοθεσία as a cognitive framework establishes Israel's filial relationship with YHWH and (2) υιοθεσία creates the nuance

185 For a full discussion of this supposition see chapter 3.

186 See Zhang, "Corporate Identity Metaphor," 375–94, for excellent analysis and illustration of the constitutive power of metaphor.

187 E.g., see P. J. Maartens, "Inference and Relevance in Paul's Allegory of the Wild Olive Tree," *HvTSt* 53.4 (1997): 1000–1029.

188 See above for a thorough explanation of the tenor and vehicle in Romans 9:4.

189 Scott, *Adoption as Sons*, 55–60; *pace* Byrne who argues that adoption "is the terminology traditionally used in the Jewish tradition to express the titles and privileges of Israel" (*Sons of God*, 128).

“adoption” within the framework of “sonship” that allows Paul to emphasize God’s sovereign choice of Israel as the covenant people.

For those who would here object that Paul was drawing upon the well-worn framework of Israel as the son of YHWH rather than coining a new image,¹⁹⁰ it is necessary to further explain what I mean by υιοθεσία establishing a framework of filial relationship with God in Romans 9:4. We have already seen that the intertextual relationships evoked by the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 are comprised of the interaction between the Pauline image, υιοθεσία, and terms such as υίός/υιοί (son/sons), πρωτότοκος (firstborn), and μονογενής (only child), which appear in other texts. Through his use of υιοθεσία as a vehicle for his metaphor in Romans 9:4, Paul is able to draw upon and reinterpret the image of Israel as the son of YHWH that is found in other texts, which lies dormant in the minds of his hearers until Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor conjures it into action.

It is here that understanding the dynamic component of intertextual relationships becomes essential to our task of reconstructing the cognitive framework created by Paul’s metaphor. Although there are other images associated with the sonship of Israel found in other texts, prior to Paul’s metaphorical statement “to whom belongs the adoption” (ὧν ἡ υιοθεσία), Paul’s audience members would have had no compelling reason to be contemplating Israel’s relationship with God through the specific cognitive framework of υιοθεσία. It is only once Paul has introduced the metaphor of υιοθεσία to his list of the privileges of Israel that his audience members mentally simulate Israel’s relationship to YHWH specifically as an adoptive relationship. This is particularly true since Paul’s use of υιοθεσία as a description of Israel’s relationship with God is unprecedented.¹⁹¹ Furthermore, though it is easy for contemporary interpreters, who often have the text laid out before them for careful study, to forget to consider the drama of hearing the text read aloud in real time, we must recognize that Paul’s use of υιοθεσία would not have been anticipated and might well have been a shocking statement for some among his audience. Thus for Paul’s audience, and in real time as his letter is being read, it is *his*

190 See especially Byrne, “Sons of God,” 1–8; Jewett, *Romans*, 563.

191 Jewett wrongly concludes that reducing υιοθεσία to adoption weakens the continuity between the Jewish people and the gentiles, preferring instead to view υιοθεσία as “sonship” (*Romans*, 563). However, if we take Paul’s choice of υιοθεσία to be a strategic way of reinterpreting the historical designation of Israel’s sonship, then there is still continuity to sonship between the Jewish people and gentiles because all sonship of YHWH occurs through adoption. In addition, Scott’s lexical analysis shows the translation “sonship” to be wanting (*Adoption as Sons*, 55–57). See also Kunst, *Römische Adoption*, for the diversity of expressions and adoption formulae in the Roman world.

use of *υιοθεσία* that likely established their perception of Israel as the son of God through adoption. For those who see the “concept” of adoption in Israel’s history,¹⁹² Paul’s use of *υιοθεσία* brings clarity to the concept by naming it, and it organizes those texts into the particular framework of adoption. J. David Cisneros argues, “Metaphors create conventional understandings by connecting phenomena with familiar cultural assumptions and experiences. Not only are they essential cognitive tools, but metaphors participate in creating fundamental understandings of texts.”¹⁹³ If Cisneros is correct,¹⁹⁴ then the framework “Israel as adopted son” is created by connecting the cultural phenomena found in other texts, and in the folk memory of Israel’s history to Paul’s framework of *υιοθεσία*. Moreover, once Paul has enlisted the particular cognitive structure of *υιοθεσία*, his continued use of the motif of sonship ensures that the framework of *υιοθεσία* and the entailments of the metaphor are sustained throughout the rest of Romans 9.

Though his specification of adoption might have produced a number of accompanying connotations, as I noted in the discussion above, several implications specific to “adoptive sonship” are the most obvious. First, Paul’s designation of “adoptive sonship” provides a structure of kinship that is “by decree” rather than “by nature.” James Dunn alludes to the change in cognitive framework created by *υιοθεσία* where he states, “The form, denoting adoptive rather than natural sonship, helps bring out the sense of election more clearly.”¹⁹⁵ In the cognitive framework of the Pauline *υιοθεσία* metaphor the filial relationship between God and Israel is created by God’s decree and designation of Israel as “son,” clearly elucidating the connection between sonship and election. Furthermore, it is striking that the cognitive structure Paul evokes by using the same vehicle for Israel’s sonship is the same as that of believers’ sonship in Romans 8:15 and 8:23, which was likely recollected by his audience members as Romans 9:4 was read.¹⁹⁶ The framework of *υιοθεσία* which Paul evokes in Romans 9:4 is one where Israel’s sonship is created by God’s initiative

192 E.g., Jewett, *Romans*, 563; Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 533.

193 Cisneros, “Contaminated Communities,” 570.

194 See also Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 62–63.

195 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 526.

196 Though commentators who see a distinction between the adoption of believers in Romans 8 and Israel’s adoption in Romans 9 rightly grasp the change in context for the metaphor (e.g., Moo, *Romans*, 562; Murray, *Romans*, vol. 2, 5; Cranfield, *Romans*, vol 2., 461; Barrett, *Romans*, 177), it seems that drawing too sharp a distinction between the occurrences misses the continuity that Paul is attempting to establish between Israel and the gentiles as the people of the covenant (see also Epp, “Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul,” 82).

and sovereign choice to make Israel his adopted son. It is important to note that in describing Israel as an adopted son, Paul couples a familial, relational, and personal framework with the sovereign choice of God. Thus God's "election," which will become an increasingly important concept in the course of Romans 9–11, begins first in the filial concept in υιοθεσία.

Israel's Adoption: Highlighting and Hiding Features of Sonship

In considering the structure which the υιοθεσία metaphor provides for Paul's description of Israel's sonship in Romans 9:4, we must also consider what elements of Israel's relationship with God are highlighted and which are hidden by the metaphor's particular structure. Perhaps Paul's most obvious achievement in ascribing υιοθεσία to Israel is to highlight for his audience that *Israel continues to have a filial relationship with God*. By combining an ethnic designation (Israelites) with a metaphor that emphasizes God's election of Israel (υιοθεσία), Paul reinforces the abiding covenant relationship between ethnic Israel and YHWH.¹⁹⁷ This ongoing relationship was by no means obvious for all of Paul's audience members, and indeed the particulars of the fate of Israel are the subject of Paul's extended discourse in Roman 9–11 (esp. 11:17–24).¹⁹⁸ In using υιοθεσία at the outset of his discussion of the place of Israel, Paul has highlighted not only the covenantal, but the *familial* relationship which forms the basis of God's ongoing care for the Israelites as his sons. Whatever wrestling Paul or his audience members do with the ongoing status of the Israelites, Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor ensures it is done through the lens of the Israelites as *sons*.

In addition to highlighting and emphasizing that the Israelites continue to possess and enjoy a familial relationship with God,¹⁹⁹ Paul's unique use of υιοθεσία to describe the filial relationship highlights several aspects of the sonship of the Israelites. First, as noted above, in using υιοθεσία Paul highlights God's divine act of election, of choosing the Israelites as his covenant people and bestowing sonship upon them. Υιοθεσία as a framework undergirds that, as Stuhlmacher succinctly states: "He is the one to whom Israel owes all her

197 Jewett, *Romans*, 562.

198 So Dunn, "The theme is Israel's destiny, not the doctrine of justification illustrated by Israel," *Romans*, vol. 2, 520.

199 Pace Reinhard Feldmeier who argues that the image of God as Father in Romans 1–8 is in tension with Paul's portrayal of God as the potter in Romans 9–11 ("Vater und Töpfer: Zur Identität Gottes in Römerbrief," in *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 377–390.

privileges!”²⁰⁰ Moreover, the element of decree is distinctive to υιοθεσία as a process of kinship formation, and thus is likely the component of Israel’s sonship that the υιοθεσία metaphor strongly emphasizes. Therefore, describing Israel’s sonship also highlights a particular aspect of God’s character as the God who graciously elects and extends kinship to his covenant people. Describing the Israelites as adoptive sons of God allows Paul to begin his discourse by emphasizing both God’s relational attributes as Father and his divine initiative to extend sonship to the Israelites, while reserving the status of firstborn for Jesus. Furthermore, the metaphor highlights the continued obligations the Israelites have as sons of the adopted Father. Based on the connection between sonship and obedience found in many of the Old Testament and intertestamental texts examined earlier, it is also possible that the failure of some Israelites to meet these covenant obligations constitutes a break in covenant, and an act of disobedience and defiance by God’s sons.²⁰¹ Only υιοθεσία as a metaphor is able to highlight these attributes simultaneously, making the metaphor an ideally suited starting place for Paul’s argument that follows.

The cognitive structure created by Paul’s υιοθεσία metaphor also limits the possible perception of his audience members toward Israel. As explained in previous chapters, metaphors are often most persuasive because of what they prohibit their audience from seeing, rather than solely because of what they bring more clearly into view.²⁰² Such is the case in Paul’s use of υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4, which seems to deliberately hide ingrained elements of kinship relationships that are found in most other filial metaphors (e.g., Exod 4:22 and πρωτότοκος); most significantly, the cognitive framework created by υιοθεσία likely prohibits the audience from entertaining notions of “naturalness” that are embedded in most other filial metaphors. Thus the audience from the

200 Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 146.

201 Scholars take note that Paul highlights Israel’s disobedience in Romans 9–11 (e.g., Glenn N. Davies, *Faith and Obedience in Romans* [JSNTSup 39, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990], 176; Cranford, “Election and Ethnicity,” 31; Longenecker, “Different Answers to Different Issues,” 102–103; Henry Thiessen, “The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9–11,” *BSac* 98 [1941]: 91). Thiessen comes the closest to identifying Israel’s disobedience with sonship, listing Deuteronomy 32:21 and Isaiah 65:1 as evidence that “Israel should have known from their own Scripture that the Gentiles would come in and they would be set aside” (“The Place of Israel,” 91). However, Thiessen overlooks both the ongoing sonship of Israel in Romans 9–11 and the faithfulness of God to his covenant people as his sons in the very texts he cites.

202 See especially the discussion in chapter 3; see also Lakoff and Turner, *More than Cool Reason*, 39–44.

outset views Israel's sonship not as something they possess as an inherent right, but as a status bestowed by divine decree.²⁰³

To some degree, the suppression of notions of natural descent in Paul's υιοθεσία metaphor disguises and tones down some of the obvious difficulties Israel's particularity as God's covenant people creates in light of their rejection of the gospel (9:2; 9:31–33; 11:1–12). At the very least, the metaphor provides Paul with a starting point that is more conducive to his defense of election in Romans 9:6–18 than other terms he might have used for Israel's sonship. For Paul, Israel's story is the story of YHWH's faithfulness to his election and covenant.²⁰⁴ His shrewd use of υιοθεσία as a description prepares his audience for his insistence that Israel's particularity is not their “natural right” but rather is theirs by God's gracious election.²⁰⁵ If their particularity rests not on their inherited ethnicity but on God's gracious election (e.g., Rom 9:6–8), then Paul is able to make the bold leap from affirming God's allegiance to the Jews to developing his argument that Israel's election is the fundamental paradigm for the election of the gentiles.²⁰⁶ If the Israelites are not “natural sons” but rather are sons by God's adoptive decree, then it also follows that the υιοθεσία metaphor effectively hides the distinction between Jew and gentile, at least in terms of election and inclusion in the people of God.²⁰⁷ Both Jew and gentile have received sonship via adoption, both are part of God's elective plan, and both can exist as part of God's covenant people. While the concept of υιοθεσία would not have removed the ethnic distinctions of Jew and gentile, the metaphor does subordinate these distinctions to the unification of Jew and gentile before God the Father as equal sons by adoption.

Metaphor and Emotion

Delineated in previous chapters, the attendant emotions that accompany a metaphorical utterance are often a large component in the overall persuasive capacity of the metaphor.²⁰⁸ A metaphor's work in changing the audience's perception of its subject by implementing a particular cognitive structure is

203 See Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 547; Pace Jewett, who argues that υιοθεσία in Romans 9:4 emphasizes gentile inclusion (“believers who do not have Jewish blood”) into ethnic Israel, who inherit sonship naturally (*Romans*, 563).

204 Mary Ann Getty, “Paul on the Covenants and the Future of Israel,” *BTB* 17 (1987): 95.

205 I do not necessarily mean to imply that other Jewish writings assume that election *is* their natural right, but just to point out that υιοθεσία leaves no room for doubt about where Paul stands on the matter.

206 J. Louis Martyn, “Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters,” *USQR* 42 (1988): 9.

207 Longenecker, “Different Answers to Different Issues,” 113.

208 See chapter 3; see also Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22–24.

but the preliminary step to changing how the audience *feels* about the particular subject. Indeed, I have argued that the success of a metaphor often depends on its ability to persuade its hearers/readers to feel a certain way about its subject, and that to understand a metaphor means to experience the emotions it evokes. How does *υιοθεσία* as a metaphorical framework influence how Paul's audience *feels* about the Israelites? What emotions are likely to be evoked if Paul's metaphor is successful in changing the perception of his audience members? Furthermore, Booth's assertion that persuasive metaphorical utterances invite the audience members to construct a narrative in which they participate must also be considered for Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 9:4,²⁰⁹ despite the fact that it occurs in a list rather than in an overtly narrative context.

Before examining the emotional effects of Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphor we must first gauge Paul's general tone of the frame in which the metaphor is placed and discern whether there is an underlying or implicit narrative structure in Romans 9:1–5. If the metaphor were found in a context that did not contain highly emotive content, then perhaps the exercise in identifying the emotional content of the metaphor would be far more speculative, since the surrounding text would do little to suggest appropriate attendant feelings to the audience. However, this is definitively not the case in the text of Romans 9:1–5. Indeed, in these opening verses of chapter 9 Paul uses some of the most emotionally charged language that occurs in his letter to the Romans.²¹⁰ Several of Kövecses' conceptual metaphors of emotion are identifiable in Paul's opening statements in verses 1–3. The presence of this emotionally charged language suggests that there is a clear path Paul wishes his audience members to follow in terms of cultivating a particular emotional response from them.

After a paean of praise for God at the end of chapter 8, Paul begins a new section of his argument in chapter 9 with a highly emotional lament over the current state of the Israelites. I have already noted the lack of transition that likely indicates Paul intended the opening verses of chapter 9 to be read at a slow and solemn pace. He then continues his lament by declaring "I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart" (λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὁδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου). As I noted in chapters five and six, Paul's location of emotion in the heart draws upon the conceptual metaphor "IMPORTANT IS CENTRAL." That Paul locates sadness within his heart indicates that the seat of his will and affections has been consumed by feelings of grief for his fellow Israelites, and indicates the importance of the "Israel question"

209 Booth, *The Company We Keep*, 293–320.

210 See Jewett, *Romans*, 556; Johann D. Kim, *God, Israel, and the Gentiles: Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9–11* (SBLDS 176, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000), 122.

for Paul. Moreover, sadness is conceptualized in two powerful ways in Paul's statement "I have great sorrow and unceasing anguish in my heart" (λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη τῇ καρδίᾳ μου). Like many other emotions, sadness can be conceptualized as fluid in a container,²¹¹ which is likely the best candidate for λύπη. . . .μεγάλη (great sorrow). Conceptualized this way, sadness is presented as a liquid that overwhelms and overflows from Paul's heart in response to the fate of his kindred. Coupled with the portrayal of sadness as a fluid in a container, ἀδιάλειπτος ὀδύνη (unceasing anguish) perhaps indicates the underlying conceptual metaphor "SADNESS IS AN OPPONENT."²¹² Paul's use of ἀδιάλειπτος (unceasing) depicts sadness relentlessly beating against Paul the same way YHWH or adversaries are depicted as dispensing unyielding blows against the Israelites (e.g., Isa 14:6; 4 Macc 10.11). In addition, ὀδύνη (anguish) can be used both of emotional or physical sicknesses or maladies, suggesting that sadness here is also conceptualized as an illness or a wound.²¹³ Conceptualized as a fluid, opponent, and illness, Paul's sadness in the opening verses sets a dire tone for the opening verses of chapter 9 and moves his audience to appreciate the importance and solemnity of Paul's argument in the coming chapters.

After setting the tone for his subsequent argument in verses 1–2, in verse 3 Paul goes even further in his desperation and says, "For I wish that I myself would be an anathema to Christ on behalf of my brothers and sisters, my kinsfolk according to the flesh" (ἡὺχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα). There is no doubt that terms like "great sorrow," "unceasing anguish," and a wish to be "anathema" represent Paul's strong emotions over the state of the Israelites, but these statements also were likely to evoke a similar set of feelings for Paul's audience members because of the "sameness of vision" Paul has cultivated throughout the previous chapters of the letter. If this is the case, then Paul's audience would encounter his list of privileges in 9:4 with similar attendant feelings of sorrow and anguish for ethnic Israel. Moreover, although Paul does not explicitly set his statements in 9:1–5 within a narrative context, their content likely evokes the broad narrative of Israel's history. Paul's language of anguish reminds the audience of Israel's historic status as God's people, and the list of privileges traces in broad contours God's historic dealings with them. Moreover, Paul's use of υἱοθεσία at the outset of the list sets the whole narrative of God's covenant dealings with Israel within a filial framework and narrative. Furthermore,

²¹¹ Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 25–26.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 25.

²¹³ *TDNT*, vol. 5, 115; Kövecses, *Metaphor and Emotion*, 25.

Paul's narration of Israel's history presents an unresolved conflict: his kinsmen have largely failed to embrace Jesus as Messiah.

By inviting his audience to participate in this narrative world, Paul invites them also to experience and empathize with his emotions over his kinsmen. Elliott argues that Paul's words deeply influence his primarily gentile audience, moving them "to share his profound and anxious compassion *for the Jews* who have not yet embraced the fulfillment of what is properly *their* destiny."²¹⁴ When they are presented with Paul's metaphor "they are Israelites, to whom belongs the *υιοθεσία*" (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται, ὧν ἡ *υιοθεσία*), the audience is encouraged to recognize that these feelings of sorrow and anguish are directed toward a group who has received the same designation—*υιοθεσία*—that they have themselves received just a few paragraphs earlier. Their shared metaphorical designation produces an even more pronounced emotional response from Paul's audience because they are able to lament from a place of personal identification. Indeed, although some contemporary interpreters are eager to point out the differences between Israel's adoption and the adoption of believers in 8:15 and 8:23, it is precisely the symmetry of the metaphorical designations that makes Paul's introduction to his exposition on Israel so compelling.

Furthermore, in addition to Paul setting the stage with a highly emotive vocabulary that likely initiated similar feelings in his audience members, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor potentially evokes a unique set of emotional responses from Paul's audience in and of itself. Because Paul does not elaborate on the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 9:4, identifying precisely what conceptual metaphors of emotion it evoked within each member of Paul's audience is impossible. The models underlying the metaphor might have created for the audience members here, in the midst of Paul's lament, a general sense of confidence in God's promises to the Israelites, as *υιοθεσία* likely evokes an image of a permanent and enduring bestowal of sonship.²¹⁵ Moreover, for those who were familiar with other expressions of sonship for Israel, the *υιοθεσία* metaphor likely created an assurance of God's particular concern for the Israelites, while also communicating that this concern rests solely on the prerogative of God's choice of the Israelites to be his adopted sons.

To those who were sympathetic to Paul's insistence that God's word had not failed for the Israelites, the metaphor of *υιοθεσία* likely confirmed their deeply rooted belief that God would be faithful to the people whom he had chosen to be his sons. The emphasis *υιοθεσία* places on God's sovereign choice likely created a glimmer of assurance at the outset that, although the present

²¹⁴ Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, 123 (emph. orig.).

²¹⁵ See Beker, "The Faithfulness of God," 16; Dunn, "Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?," 16.

situation for the Israelites seemed dire, God had chosen the Israelites and would act graciously toward his sons. As Paul himself says later, “the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable” (ἀμεταμέλητα γὰρ τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ) (Rom 11:29). For those among Paul’s audience who were less sympathetic to his stance toward ethnic Israel, it is possible that Paul’s emotive vocabulary leading up to the υἰοθεσία metaphor, and the *pathos* associated with the metaphor itself, moved their emotions and caused them to identify more closely with the plight of the Israelites.

Metaphor and Community

Though it is hopefully apparent by this point that Paul’s use of the υἰοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 likely had a considerable effect on the audience’s perception of Israel, and perhaps even the emotions that might have accompanied their viewing Israel through the cognitive framework of adoption, the ramifications of this perception on the creation of intimacy and the identity of the community of Paul’s audience remains to be examined. If Paul has successfully persuaded his audience members to see the Israelites as he sees them, and to feel about them the way that he feels about them, then he has succeeded in creating a “sameness of vision” between himself and his audience members.²¹⁶ Furthermore, if he has been successful, this “sameness of vision” also exists between his audience members themselves. As described in previous chapters, the creation of “sameness of vision” draws audience members closer to the author and closer to one another. This forms the foundation both for the intimacy the metaphor creates and also for the sense of identity the community gains from understanding and appropriating Paul’s metaphor.²¹⁷

Creation of Intimacy

In the other υἰοθεσία metaphors, the sameness of vision Paul achieves is primarily directed inward toward other members of the community Paul is addressing, coloring and influencing how they perceive one another. What is unique about the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is that the sameness of vision, rather than being directed inward toward members of the community, is directed toward the entity “Israel.” In light of this significant difference between the υἰοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 and the other occurrences of υἰοθεσία, the intimacy the metaphor creates as it appears in Romans 9:4 takes on several new dimensions. Beyond creating intimate bonds between audience members through the recognition of a shared vision of Israel, the metaphor created feelings of

²¹⁶ Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22–24.

²¹⁷ See also Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 10–12.

intimacy between Paul's audience members *and the Israelites*, who in Romans 9:4 receive the same designation of *υιοθεσία* that Paul has already predicated of believers. To investigate the implications of the intimacy Paul achieves with his metaphor in Romans 9:4, each of these cultivations of intimacy between author, audience, and the Israelites must be examined separately and in more detail.

Like the metaphors examined in previous chapters, Paul's *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans 9:4 creates an intimate connection between Paul and his audience members that arises from their shared understanding of the Israelites as receiving *υιοθεσία* from God,²¹⁸ since metaphors by nature create bonds between their sharers and barriers for those outside the community.²¹⁹ As Trebilco states, "While a community will use language in its own distinctive way to construct and maintain its identity, to construct meaning, and to symbolise loyalty and solidarity, that language, once used, impacts on how identity is understood."²²⁰ This is the same dialectic created by Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4, which extends an invitation to the audience members to participate with its creator (in this case Paul) in viewing its subject (in this case Israel's relationship with God) through a particular cognitive framework (in this case *υιοθεσία*).²²¹ Moreover, when the audience member decides to join in, Paul has not only succeeded in communicating cognitive content about the metaphor's subject, but also has succeeded in creating an intimate bond

218 Coupled closely with Paul's success in creating a sameness of vision is the potential that Paul's use of *υιοθεσία* as the designation for Israel's sonship created sameness of vision for how his audience perceives other manifestations of the sonship tradition. For those audience members who were aware of the intertextual relationship between Romans 9:4 and other texts in the sonship tradition it is probable that Paul's metaphor reinterpreted at least some aspects of the understanding of Israel's sonship created by those texts. For the audience members who were aware of these relationships, Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 potentially cultivated a high degree of intimacy resulting not only from a shared understanding of the Israelites, which is apparent from a surface reading of Romans 9:4, but also from a shared understanding of the whole history of Israel's designation as the *υιός* or *υιός* of *ΥΗΩΗ*. This also assumes that Paul was successful in achieving the sameness of vision created by the metaphor and the attendant intertextual connections. Of course it is also possible that some members were not persuaded to join in Paul's vision of the Israelites as adopted sons. For those members then, no intimate bond would have been created by the metaphor. For a further explanation of this phenomenon see Cohen, "Some Philosophy," 30–45.

219 Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.

220 Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 8.

221 See chapter 3 for a fuller discussion; see also Cohen, "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy," 1–10.

between himself and the audience member in regard to how they both understand Israel.²²²

This is particularly poignant for Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 because the intimate bond is created by a sameness of vision that is directed outward, toward a group of people (the Israelites) who themselves might not share in the vision Paul has cast for them. Because the metaphor is directed toward a group outside Paul's addressees,²²³ the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is even more likely to create the recognition that the "figurative use can be inaccessible to all but those who share information about one another's knowledge beliefs, intentions, and attitudes."²²⁴ Paul's application of a unique term for the privilege of the ethnic Israelites, while affirming their continuing status before God, also creates a strong intimate bond between himself and his audience members who can participate with him in viewing ethnic Israel through his particular construct of *υιοθεσία*.

One surprising element of the intimacy created by Paul's use of *υιοθεσία* is its potential to have effected a perceived bond between the Israelites and the believers. Paul, by utilizing the same cognitive structure through which believers view themselves and through which believers view ethnic Israel creates the potential for feelings of empathy and intimacy toward the Israelites. However, it is unlikely that the Israelites who were not part of the community of Christ-followers would have recognized this bond of intimacy created by the shared designation of "adopted son," which Paul predicates both of Israelites and Christ-followers. Nevertheless, despite the fact that the Israelites might not all share Paul's willingness to designate both Jews and gentiles as adopted sons of God, it is arguable that *Paul's audience* might have understood some intimate bond existing between themselves and the people of Israel. By appropriating terms from the Old Testament and applying them to new Christian communities (both Jew and gentile), Paul is claiming that the new Christian communities share continuity with the people of God (Israel) in the Old Testament.²²⁵

222 For a related discussion of the *pathos* Paul achieves, see Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans*, 122–24.

223 Paul's consistent use of third plural pronouns throughout Romans 9–11, rather than first plural or second plural suggests that although he wishes to underscore the commonality between Israel and his audience, he addresses "Israel" as a group absent from the conversation he is presently having with his community of readers. However, this does not preclude the strong possibility that at least some among Paul's audience were Jewish-Christians, and thus were included in the group he addresses directly (*pace* Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, and Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*).

224 Cohen, "Cultivation of Intimacy," 7.

225 Trebilco, *Self-Designations*, 308.

Therefore, in using the label *υιοθεσία*, Paul highlights what he deems to be an important shared feature between the Israelites and the Christian community, the bond of kinship. If Paul's audience adopts his vision of ethnic Israelites, the feelings of intimacy Paul is able to cultivate by using the same metaphorical designation for Israelites and believers provide Paul with a strong starting point for the rest of his argument regarding the fate of Israel. The symmetry of designations for believers and ethnic Israel creates a vested interest for the believers in what outcome awaits their fellow adopted sons.

Creation of Identity

As described in previous chapters, metaphors can function as powerful forces in the formation of group identity.²²⁶ Metaphors can function as agents that reinforce group boundaries by creating a barrier between community members who share a "sameness of vision" and outsiders who are unable to understand the metaphor.²²⁷ Group members also often utilize metaphors to label common group experience or self-understanding, thus the metaphor becomes a symbolic representation of the shared experiences of group members.²²⁸ Significant for our discussion here, I also noted that not all metaphors are "identity-forming metaphors."²²⁹ Indeed, in examining Paul's metaphorical designation of the Israelites as adopted sons it is tempting to conclude that this metaphor does little to form or reshape the group identity of Paul's audience because it is not directed at his audience members. To be sure, because the metaphor in Romans 9:4 is a description of "the Israelites,"—a group that Paul ostensibly sees as distinct, at least in some ways, from his addressees—perhaps it is unlikely that the metaphor had as much impact on the self-understanding of Paul's audience as other occurrences of *υιοθεσία* where the metaphor is applied directly to his audience members.

However, even this occurrence of *υιοθεσία* contributes to the self-understanding of Paul's audience members, despite it being applied to the Israelites. First, Paul's idiolectic use of *υιοθεσία* as a metaphorical description creates a

²²⁶ See chapter 3.

²²⁷ Recall also that "understanding" the metaphor in the fullest sense means to be able to experience the metaphor's attendant emotions and share in the intimate bond between the metaphor maker and metaphor understanders. Cohen, *Thinking of Others*, 22–24; Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 12.

²²⁸ Zhang, "Corporate Identity," 390–91.

²²⁹ The less idiosyncratic and the more common a metaphor is in the dominant culture, the less likely it is that the use of the metaphor influences the self-understanding of a particular sub-group; see chapter 2 for a fuller discussion.

“sameness of vision” of the Israelites that can only be shared by members of Paul’s addressees (since it is not used elsewhere). Thus although the metaphor is applied to “outsiders,” it still subtly reinforces a boundary around the community’s understanding of Israelites as “adopted sons” in contrast to the other terms for sonship found in other sources. Yet somewhat paradoxically, while subtly erecting a boundary around the group the metaphor also overtly emphasizes the commonality between the Israelites and the believers who are both “adopted sons.” Paul’s symmetrical use of υἱοθεσία of both believers and Israelites may have functioned to draw the believers into the story of Israel, wherein all of the adopted sons stand in solidarity as children of Israel’s God.²³⁰ In saying this I do not mean to suggest that the metaphor did away with some key distinctions between the Israelites and believers that seem to be inherent in Paul’s argument in Romans 9–11.²³¹ Rather, the symmetry of Paul’s designation for believers and Israelites indicates the intrinsic tension between the Israelites as the recipients of God’s promises but whose rejection of Jesus as Messiah has also, in Paul’s mind, rendered them outsiders to the community of Christ-followers. Moreover, the metaphor points to Paul’s extension and reappropriation of these promises made originally to the Israelites for the community of believers as a whole, both Jew and gentile. Each of these proposals for the role of the υἱοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 in identity formation require a thorough analysis before either can be adopted with any certainty.

As noted earlier, υἱοθεσία as a description of Israel’s sonship is unique to Paul, and other sources that designate Israel as the son of God prefer the terms υἱός/υἱοί (son/sons), πρωτότοκος (firstborn) and μονογενής (only child) for the vehicles of their metaphors. Here, then, the task is to examine the possible impact Paul’s unique term had on the *formation of identity for his addressees*. Though it may seem a rather minor point given the prevalence of other sonship metaphors predicated of Israel, the fact that only Paul uses the term υἱοθεσία as a designation for Israel’s sonship means that only Paul’s addressees are extended the opportunity to view Israel’s sonship through his unique construct of υἱοθεσία.

Moreover, those addressees who are familiar with other texts of the sonship tradition have the opportunity to reinterpret those texts in light of the Pauline metaphor. Indeed, it is possible that the uniqueness of the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 actually creates a shared experience of reflecting on the metaphor for Paul’s audience members. This is not to say that the addressees were

²³⁰ See Richard Hays, “Is Paul’s Gospel Narratable?,” *JSNT* 27.2 (2004): 235.

²³¹ See Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 117–48 for an excellent explanation of the importance of distinguishing between kinship and ethnicity in Paul’s letters.

consciously reflecting on the differences between Paul's unique term *υιοθεσία* and other, more common terms for sonship in the Old Testament and intertestamental sources. Indeed, reflection on the metaphor need not be a conscious cognitive exercise. The hearer may not be fully aware of the way in which the cognitive model which underlies a metaphorical expression shapes his or her thought by means of mental simulation.²³² Thus it is possible, whether Paul's audience members were conscious of the metaphor's potential or not, that *υιοθεσία* in Romans 9:4 is working subliminally to reframe the understanding of Israel's sonship within the collective of Paul's addressees.

When the collective adopts this new understanding of Israel as the adopted sons of God they also partake in sharing the unique "sameness of vision" created by the metaphor. The unique sameness of vision Paul achieves in his metaphor in Romans 9:4 distinguishes his community members (who share in his vision) from all other "outsiders" who, for various reasons, would reject Paul's metaphorical description of Israel's adopted sonship. The uniqueness of Paul's metaphor, and the correlated uniqueness of the "sameness of vision" Paul achieves, *is precisely what aids in the construction of group identity*. Through the performative utterance in Romans 9:4, Paul's addressees become "those who understand the Israelites as the *adopted* sons of God."

At the same time Paul's metaphor is subtly creating a boundary around his addressees by means of a sameness of vision of Israel's sonship, his metaphor in Romans 9:4 also draws a plain parallel between the sonship of believers and the sonship of the Israelites. If *υιοθεσία* were an example of an unremarkable, pedestrian metaphor then we might be able to dismiss the identical designations in Romans 8 and Romans 9 as equally unremarkable. However, this is decidedly not the case. The metaphorical use of *υιοθεσία* is unparalleled, and thus its application to these two distinct subjects is significant because of their scarcity. Richard Hays has persuasively argued that Paul is "a first-century Jewish thinker who, while undergoing a profound disjuncture with his own religious tradition, grappled his way through to a vigorous and theologically generative reappropriation of Israel's scriptures."²³³ This raises the question of how Paul's reappropriation, and re-labeling, of Israel's sonship might help Paul's audience to find its identity within God's story of election and redemption.²³⁴ Furthermore, N. T. Wright notes that Paul's primary concern is

²³² Dawes, *The Body in Question*, 69.

²³³ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 2.

²³⁴ See also Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 147–48.

to reconfigure the story of God's covenant people around their shared eschatological destiny through Israel's Messiah.²³⁵

If Hays and Wright are correct, and Paul is urging his readers to reimagine their identity around the Messiah of Israel, or perhaps even more pointedly, to reimagine Israel in light of Christ as Israel's Messiah, then is it possible that υιοθεσία provides a point of commonality for these twin assertions? Throughout Romans 9–11 there is an interesting dialectic between the Israelites as the recipients of the privileges (9:4) and the “cultivated olive tree's natural branches,” and Paul's addressees (presumably mostly gentiles) whom he describes in contrasting terms such as “not my people” (9:26), “those who did not seek me” (10:20), and “a wild olive shoot” (11:17). However, though Paul draws a distinction between the Israelites and his addressees, his use of the same metaphor—υιοθεσία—as a description for both believers and Israelites, and his continual reinterpretation and reappropriation of Scripture throughout Romans 9–11 suggests that he sees tremendous continuity between the believers and the Israelites.²³⁶ Perhaps what Paul achieves in labeling the Israelites with the same kind of sonship as the believers is an identity for his addressees that stands in solidarity and continuity with the people of Israel. As Dunn notes, the choice of υιοθεσία “was evidently deliberately chosen to remind the predominantly gentile audience that the blessings they share are Israel's blessings.”²³⁷ This is further evidenced by the nature of υιοθεσία itself. Whereas a metaphor built upon natural or biological sonship does not easily transcend ethnic barriers, υιοθεσία is uniquely positioned to ascribe an equal status of sonship to both the ethnic Israelites and the believers, though there was undoubtedly ethnic diversity represented between these groups of people.²³⁸ Perhaps it is here that Paul's metaphor is truly revolutionary. Whereas some other sonship metaphors (e.g., πρωτότοκος/firstborn or μονογενής/only child) would likely have communicated connotations of ethnic exclusivity for the Israelites, Paul's use of υιοθεσία can affirm the ethnic particularity of Israel as the recipients of God's covenant while simultaneously extending the

235 Wright, *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*, 135–40.

236 See also Bruce Longenecker, “Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings?: The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: WJK, 2002), 58–84; Morna Hooker, “‘Heirs of Abraham’: The Gentiles’ Role in Israel's Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: WJK, 2002), 85–96.

237 Dunn, *Romans*, vol. 2, 522.

238 So Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 117–35.

possibility of sonship beyond the confines of the Israelites, precisely because God's people, both Jew and gentile, are sons by *adoption* and not birth. Thus Paul's addressees can participate fully in Israel's heritage and in Israel's messiah because they have been included in the family of YHWH in the same manner as the Israelites themselves, through *adoption*.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have sought to demonstrate that far from being a traditional, unremarkable, or pedestrian way of referring to Israel as the covenant people of God, Paul's metaphorical designation of υἱοθεσία for ethnic Israel reframes and reinterprets numerous aspects of Israel's history and Scripture, and reshapes Paul's audience's understanding of their own identity as co-participants with Israel in the adoption to sonship. To be sure, Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 occurs in a drastically different frame than the two previous occurrences of υἱοθεσία in Romans 8, and its tenor has shifted its referent from the identity of believers (Romans 8:15–23) to Paul's own familial description of God's covenant relationship with Israel in Romans 9. Moreover, I noted that because Paul's metaphor uses an original term for Israel's sonship—υἱοθεσία—and because this term has been repeated from Romans 8, we can characterize Paul's metaphor in Romans 9:4 as one possessing both emphasis and resonance. Indeed, the υἱοθεσία metaphor sets the tone for the unfolding theme of sonship, which occurs throughout Paul's discourse in Romans 9.

Furthermore, I argued that the predication of υἱοθεσία of the Israelites raised an unusual intertextual issue in Romans 9:4 because Paul is not “transposing” an allusion or echo from another text, but rather creating his own “reflection” by using idiosyncratic terminology to simultaneously evoke and reinterpret other earlier texts where “Israelite sonship” occurs. In so doing, Paul simultaneously affirms the particularity of Israel's sonship through election while also extending the possibility of sonship beyond the confines of ethnic Israel. The overall effect of the metaphor is to shape the perception of the Israelites for Paul's audience through the specific cognitive framework of adoption over and against competing frameworks, such as πρωτότοκος (firstborn). Because Paul's metaphor is highly specific to his view of Israel, it has a strong potential for effecting feelings of intimacy and creating a distinct identity within the community of his audience. In Romans 9:4, Paul's metaphor achieves a “sameness of vision” in regard to Israel, ultimately uniting his audience together in their shared concern for Israel as God's chosen people, and their brothers and sisters through adoption.

Toward a Synthesis of the υιοθεσία Metaphors

In this work I have sought to demonstrate the need for a rigorous and well-rounded methodology for reading the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians. I argued that although previous studies have addressed the question of the metaphors' background in great detail, reading biblical metaphors requires a sophisticated and carefully thought out hermeneutic that combines knowledge of background and historical context with an understanding of how metaphors, as textual elements, work with their underlying models and their surrounding literary context (frames) to create meaning. Furthermore, I argued that a rigorous methodology must also examine a metaphor's extra-textual elements, which influence the perceptions, emotions, and identity of its hearers/readers. The three exegetical chapters (chapters 5–7) utilized this methodology to demonstrate that although the υιοθεσία metaphors have some overlap in their content, there are also subtle nuances in their meanings and in the ways they likely shaped the perceptions and affective responses within Paul's audiences in Galatia and Rome.

Concluding Summary and Synthesis

The Contribution of Each Chapter

In the first section of this work I offered a defense of a methodology for reading the υιοθεσία metaphors that utilized insights from a cross-section of disciplines, drawing mainly on advances in the areas of philosophy of language and cognitive linguistics. This methodology represents a significant paradigm shift from the way the υιοθεσία metaphors in Galatians and Romans have thus far been approached and interpreted. I argued that utilizing a methodology more attuned to the ways in which metaphors work to produce meaning and perception would illuminate aspects of the υιοθεσία metaphors that often are under-appreciated in studies that treat the interpretation of metaphors as a straightforward process.

After identifying the methodological shortcomings of previous studies on the υιοθεσία metaphors in chapter one, in chapter two I addressed the textual elements of a metaphor, including the problem of defining a metaphorical utterance and the locus of metaphorical meaning. I argued that Soskice's definition of a metaphor as "that figure of speech whereby we speak about one

thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another," would provide the highest level of precision for identifying and pinpointing the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Galatians and Romans. Drawing on Soskice's insights, I argued that the meaning of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors occurs at the level of a complete utterance, and thus it is inappropriate to speak of a univocal metaphorical meaning for the lexeme *υιοθεσία*. Moreover, I showed that as textual elements, metaphors are significantly impacted by changes in their frames and tenors. I also argued that although metaphors are polyvalent in meaning, metaphorical meaning is not of a lower truth caliber than literal utterances. Indeed, metaphors often provide a window to truths that are only accessible through a particular metaphor. Thus it is important when addressing the *υιοθεσία* metaphors not to think of them as metaphors "*for X*," but as utterances which create meanings and mental states only accessible through the particular utterance and framework "*υιοθεσία*."

In chapter three I demonstrated the value of combining insights from cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics that illuminate the extra-textual features of a metaphor with the theories of chapter two which treat metaphor as a textual phenomenon. Drawing upon the insights of cognitive theorists such as Lakoff, Johnson, Bergen, Turner, and Kövecses I argued that in order to understand the full impact of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors one must also attend to the cognitive structure they provide and the affective responses they were likely to elicit. Rather than being neutral conduits of information, cognitive theorists have showed metaphors to be powerful performative utterances which structure the perceptions of their readers/hearers by highlighting and hiding certain features of their subjects (tenors). Moreover, in addition to their cognitive content, Cohen and Kövecses have argued that metaphors elicit emotional responses from their audiences. Cohen has further asserted that these emotional responses contribute to feelings of intimacy between author and audience members by creating a "sameness of vision" regarding the metaphor's subject. This "sameness of vision" creates bonds between those who participate in the metaphor (the author and the audience members) and erects barriers for community outsiders (who do not share the "sameness of vision"). Given the capacity of metaphors to influence not only extra-textual elements (such as cognition and perception) but also to influence areas that go beyond cognitive content (e.g., emotion and identity), I argued that metaphors also have a powerful social function within communities. Thus in analyzing the *υιοθεσία* metaphors one must attend to the way these metaphors likely influenced the perception of Paul's audience members, and also to the social function of these metaphors in terms of their capacity to create a "sameness of vision" and solidify

the bonds and boundaries for the members of the communities in Galatia and Rome.

In chapter four I provided a rough sketch of the various models that might underlie the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in the Pauline text, and I also addressed how these models work within each metaphorical utterance to create meaning. Because Paul's audience members were most likely influenced by Greek and Roman practices of adoption and by texts in the Jewish sonship tradition, each of these backgrounds were examined to provide a foundation for the discussions of model and vehicle in each exegetical chapter. One critical distinction between my methodological approach and that of previous studies is my assertion that a metaphor's meaning cannot be reduced to its model (or background), nor is it possible to conclude that only one model is present to the exclusion of all others. However, I also argued that although no one model can be completely ruled out, the various frames of the metaphors sometimes bring one model closer to the surface and push another further under in submersion. Thus the models are not equally present in every context, or for every reader/hearer, but rather each context suggests some models more strongly than others.

In part two of this study I sought to demonstrate the usefulness of a methodology drawn from contemporary metaphor theories for analyzing the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Galatians and Romans in exegesis. In each chapter I identified the metaphorical utterance (or utterances) and the frames in which *υιοθεσία* occurred, and then argued for the most likely candidate for the metaphor's model, tenor, and vehicle. In addition, I also treated the extra-textual features of each *υιοθεσία* metaphor, identifying the ways in which these metaphors influenced the perceptions of the audience members regarding the metaphors' tenors and the various emotional responses they likely elicited. I then argued that these extra-textual features contributed to feelings of intimacy and a "sameness of vision" created between Paul and his audience members, which solidified bonds between them and erected boundaries for outsiders.

In comparing each exegetical chapter the differences between the *υιοθεσία* metaphors are easily seen, both in terms of their textual features and in terms of the effect on the perceptions, emotions, and identity of their respective audiences. In light of the methodological premise that metaphors are not easily synthesized into a univocal meaning, it is prudent to review the individual contribution of each *υιοθεσία* metaphor and to highlight these differences before carefully moving toward a synthetic analysis. In chapter five I treated the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5, and I argued that the primary emphasis of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor was to change the way Paul's audience of Galatian

gentiles perceived and understood their spiritual lineage. In light of the agitators' emphasis on the importance of lineage through law observance, Paul is concerned with establishing a framework that provides a spiritual lineage which bypasses the need for his gentile audience to observe Torah. Υιοθεσία accomplishes this in Galatians 4:5. By using υιοθεσία as a cognitive framework through which to view inclusion in the people of God, Paul made clear that sonship came through the initiative of the Father, was carried out by the mission of the Son, and attested through the witness of the Spirit. Thus the vertical elements of the υιοθεσία metaphor regarding how the believers related to God were most prominent in Galatians 4:5. Moreover, Paul grounded his υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5 in the community's shared experience of receiving the Spirit, which intimately connected the Spirit to sonship and solidified their assurance of their spiritual lineage as children of God.

In chapter six I analyzed the diptych of υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15 and Romans 8:23, and argued that these two metaphors work to produce the perception of acute eschatological and existential tension for Paul's audience in Rome. Unlike the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians 4:5, the two metaphors in Romans 8 contain a much stronger emphasis on the horizontal dimensions of community membership. Paul's frame in Romans 8 connects the audience's reception of the Spirit of υιοθεσία with their experience as co-sufferers with Christ (Rom 8:17), and with their feeling of eschatological displacement and longing for the completion of their restoration (Rom 8:23). This emphasis on displacement solidifies the bonds between members of Paul's audience by creating a "sameness of vision" which highlights their shared existence as those who belong to the age to come and deemphasizes their relationship to the things of the flesh (τὰ τῆς σαρκός). Thus the diptych of metaphors in Romans 8 provides a filial and familial grid through which the believers in Rome process their community membership and their experiences of suffering, displacement, and hope.

In chapter seven I analyzed the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4, which is arguably the most vexing and difficult occurrence from a methodological standpoint. Although I argued that the predominant model in play for the υιοθεσία metaphors in Galatians 4 and in Romans 8 was Roman adoption, in Romans 9:4 the Jewish sonship tradition as a model for υιοθεσία is drawn firmly into view. However, because υιοθεσία does not occur in the LXX or in the intertestamental literature, the intertextual relationships between the Pauline metaphor in Romans 9:4 and other texts in the Jewish sonship tradition are together a complicated and intricate example of metalepsis. Rather than Paul merely appropriating material from precursor texts, Paul uses his own metaphor (υιοθεσία) to function as a reflecting surface that constrains and interprets

the texts he draws upon. As Paul's reflection, the υιοθεσία metaphor in Romans 9:4 highlights God's elective and covenantal actions toward Israel while hiding the importance of natural descent. Moreover, because υιοθεσία separates sonship from natural descent, Paul's use of υιοθεσία as a vehicle to describe God's covenant relationship with Israel extends the possibility of sonship to non-Israelites much more readily than the vehicles such as πρωτότοκος (firstborn) and μονογενής (only child), which are present in other iterations of sonship metaphors in precursor texts. Unlike the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8, the "sameness of vision" Paul achieves through his metaphor in Romans 9:4 directs the attention of the community toward Israel rather than towards themselves. However, this sameness of vision highlights the commonality between Israel and believers as those who have been designated adopted sons. Their shared designation elicits an emotional response from Paul's audience members to lament over the fate of Israel as not only Paul's, but also their kinsfolk through adoption (e.g., Rom 9:1–3).

Toward a Synthesis

Having treated each of the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors in its own right in the previous exegetical chapters, here a few remarks of synthesis regarding the spectrum of meanings created by the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are warranted. However, although I will here put forth a synthesis of several aspects of the υιοθεσία metaphors, I do not mean to imply that it is appropriate to distill them into a univocal meaning drawn from the sum total of their meanings in their individual contexts. Rather, the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans and Galatians are much more akin to the bands of color in a rainbow; one must not be tempted to remove the methodological prism that shows them to be discrete colors that comprise a beam of white light. Instead, the prism must continue to be used to appreciate the distinct colors that make up the spectrum of meaning of the υιοθεσία metaphors in Galatians and Romans, while also keeping in mind that these colors are contiguous parts of the whole spectrum.

The Role of Models and Frames

As I stated above, there are subtle differences in the meanings and implications of the υιοθεσία metaphors as they appear in their individual contexts. In addition, several other prominent differences emerge into view if the results of the exegetical analysis of each metaphor are compared. Chief among these differences is that the relationship between the υιοθεσία metaphor and its underlying model changes slightly in each context. In Galatians 4:5 and Romans 8:15 the predominant model in view is that of Roman adoption, in Romans 8:23

the metaphor's connection to the model of Roman adoption is slightly more vague, whereas in Romans 9:4 the Jewish sonship model predominates, but is interwoven with the model of Roman adoption. The shifting models underlying the four υιοθεσία metaphors produce a spectrum of meaning based on a range of possible associations these models evoke, which may vary slightly or substantially between contexts. This finding is significant because it demonstrates the inadequacy of attempting to identify and associate a single background for a biblical metaphor. Rather, the relationship between metaphor and model is complex and somewhat fluid between contexts.

Moreover, as I stated above, each iteration of a υιοθεσία metaphor communicates a slightly different set of implications and creates a slightly different cognitive framework and mental simulation for the audience members, in large part because of the differences between their surrounding frames and underlying models. Thus the audiences in Galatia and Rome come away with slightly different, though undoubtedly complementary, understandings of the significance of their adoption as believers in Christ. In Galatians 4:5 the metaphor functions to underscore the inclusion of the gentiles in the community of faith by God's adoption rather than by law observance. Because Paul's primary objective in Galatians was to convince the Galatian believers that their inclusion in the community of God is through the faithful death of Jesus rather than through observance of the law, he uses the υιοθεσία metaphor to highlight another facet of God's initiating act to bring humanity into relationship with him. Thus for the Galatian audience, the υιοθεσία metaphor primarily functions to enrich their understanding of God's inclusive action towards them and, as a result of that action, their full inclusion in the community of God. Moreover, the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians is not overly fraught with emotional language, and the emotional content of the metaphor again emphasizes the relational closeness of the believer and God through the *'abbā* cry of the Spirit. Like the cognitive framework created by the metaphor in Galatians 4:5, the metaphor's emotional content further highlights the vertical implications of the metaphor by focusing the audience's attention on the intimate bond adoption creates between the Triune God and the believer, which is evidenced by the Spirit's cry from the heart.

For the community in Rome, Paul uses the υιοθεσία metaphors primarily to highlight the eschatological and existential tension that characterizes life in the community of faith. Moreover, the combination of the three υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans highlights the commonality between Jews and gentiles by emphasizing that God extends sonship to both groups through adoption. In Romans 9:4 the emotional response evoked by the υιοθεσία metaphor functions primarily to create feelings of sorrow and empathy for unbelieving Israel.

Like the metaphors in Romans 8:15–23, this emotional response primarily emphasizes the horizontal bonds between believers who share a “sameness of vision” toward Israel. Through highlighting the shared identity of the believers and the Israelites as sons of God, and their shared experience of eschatological and existential displacement, the υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans solidify the bonds between the audience members in Rome and the boundaries around the Roman community of believers. At the same time, the combination of the three metaphors creates an empathic view of Israel and a shared experience of Paul’s angst and sorrow over his ethnic kinsfolk.

Likewise, the emotional responses evoked by the three υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans differ in some important ways from the emotional response evoked by the metaphor in Galatians 4:5. The combination of the two υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans 8:15–23 elicits an emotional response from the audience that reflects the tension present throughout the passage, which is seen in both the dichotomous pairings of σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit), and in the motif of groaning and suffering. In Romans 8, the υιοθεσία metaphors highlight the emotional, existential, and eschatological tension the believers experience as they are caught between the σάρξ (flesh) and πνεῦμα (Spirit) tension which Paul portrays as endemic to the life of the believer. As the υιοθεσία metaphor works in conjunction with its surrounding frame to highlight the existential and the emotional tension which characterizes life in the community of faith, the believers in Rome are drawn together in intimate bonds which emphasize their common ground and shared experiences.

In sum, the υιοθεσία metaphor in Galatians creates a cognitive framework and elicits an emotional response that sharply emphasizes the vertical dimensions of the metaphor whereas the cognitive framework created by the three υιοθεσία metaphors in Romans brings the metaphors’ horizontal implications to the fore. Here, at the end of the exegetical process, these sets of implications may be now combined in order to speak of a Pauline “theology” of υιοθεσία which includes insights from each adoption metaphor, or they may be kept separate in order to better appreciate the role each υιοθεσία metaphor plays in tailoring Paul’s argument to the specific concerns of his audience members.

Areas of Commonality between the υιοθεσία Metaphors in Romans and Galatians

Although there are significant differences between the implicative complexes of the four metaphors, like the discrete colors which are joined together in a single beam of white light, in several areas the implications of the υιοθεσία metaphors are also clearly contiguous parts of the same spectrum of meaning. For

example, despite the differences in their underlying models, and differences in their frames and intended purposes, both Galatians 4:5 and Romans 9:4 emphasize God's divine action in extending sonship apart from ethnicity. In both Romans and Galatians, whether predicated of Israelites or gentiles, Paul consistently portrays sonship as bestowed through God's divine initiative and transcendent of ethnic boundaries. Thus for Paul sonship is contingent upon the action and will of the Triune God, and the people of God are drawn into sonship through the covenanting actions of the Trinity. In all instances of a *υιοθεσία* metaphor Paul portrays sonship in terms of adoption, which means that sonship in Paul's view is not inherited, but rather is brought about and bestowed through the gracious action of God.

Another noteworthy commonality between the *υιοθεσία* metaphors in Romans 8:15–23 and Galatians 4:5 is their shared connection between adoption and the reception of the Spirit. Although their respective frames are different, and although the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Galatians 4:5 primarily highlights its vertical implications while the metaphors in Romans 8:15–23 emphasize the horizontal dimensions, in each case Paul grounds the *υιοθεσία* metaphors predicated of believers in their experience of receiving the Spirit. Thus in both Romans and Galatians the *υιοθεσία* metaphors (with the exception of Romans 9:4) provide a cognitive framework through which the audience views their experience of the Spirit. Through the *υιοθεσία* metaphors, their shared experience of the Spirit also becomes a shared experience of sonship and familial belonging. Moreover, in both Romans and Galatians Paul connects the *υιοθεσία* metaphor with the *'abbā* cry, which signals that the believers' adoption to sonship has brought them into an intimate relationship with the Father through their identification with the Son, to which the Spirit testifies in the hearts of the believers. This grounding of sonship in the experience of the Spirit also elicits a unifying emotional response from the believers, thus uniting not only the believers of the individual communities in Rome and Galatia, but potentially also creating a sense of unity between geographically dispersed Christian communities.

Undoubtedly much more could be said regarding the implications of the areas of synthesis I have identified for subsections of Pauline theology such as soteriology, eschatology, ecclesiology, and ethics. However, such an endeavor falls beyond the purview of this study. Nevertheless, here it is enough to note that the diverse voices of the *υιοθεσία* metaphors speak in harmony with one another, drawing upon a consistent portrayal of God's action toward humanity and grounding the sonship of believers in the shared experience of the Spirit. Thus although it is inappropriate to speak of a univocal "meaning" of the *υιοθεσία* metaphor in Romans and Galatians, lest the subtleties of each

occurrence of the metaphor and its individual cognitive framework and emotional response be minimized, it is appropriate to speak of the metaphors each contributing to a unified, consistent, and complementary picture of the Pauline idea of adoption to sonship. This unity occurs in the midst of the diversity of the metaphors and their implications, and must not be equated with uniformity. Rather, though they are distinct, there is coherence between the υιοθεσία metaphors, both in the themes of the metaphors themselves, and in their potential to unify the audiences of Paul's letters under the metaphorical expression of υιοθεσία.

Pauline Theology and the Hermeneutics of Metaphor

Though this study was restricted to an examination of the υιοθεσία metaphors in Galatians and Romans, the methodology developed in this study potentially opens new avenues of inquiry for other Pauline metaphors as well. Because of their infrequency in Pauline literature, the Pauline υιοθεσία metaphors were well suited to illustrate the usefulness and importance of contemporary theories of metaphor for the exegesis of biblical metaphors in general. Thus the question must be raised: If the methodology I have proposed in this study were applied to other Pauline metaphors, what ramifications would such a method have for the way that Pauline theology is conducted? Here I will sketch the contours of four areas where the application of this study's methodology might significantly shift the framework for several important discussions in Pauline studies.

Identifying Metaphors in the Pauline Text

The most fundamental step in moving dialogue forward is to recognize the *metaphorical* nature of key Pauline themes (e.g., justification, redemption, and so forth). If we treat these themes as *metaphors*, two key methodological starting points emerge: (1) Pauline metaphors must first be analyzed in terms of their *liveliness* and *strength*, and (2) Pauline scholars must recognize that they are working with multiple *metaphors* that possess individual meanings rather than various iterations of the same *metaphor* that can be systematized into a univocal Pauline meaning. These two tenets have the potential to reframe several current discussions within Pauline studies. For example, in regard to liveliness and novelty, scholars might examine whether Paul's metaphors that speak of sin in terms of enslavement (e.g., Rom 6:6–20; 7:14) are more or less novel than his language that speaks about sin as a legal offense (e.g., Rom 2:12; 3:23; 5:16; cf. 1 Tim 5:24). Or, for example, we might consider if Paul's use of redemption

is a novel way to speak about the resurrection of the body (Rom 8:23), and whether the occurrence of a redemption metaphor in Romans 8:23 have the same level of resonance as the redemption metaphor in Romans 3:24 has. Or is redemption a less novel and less lively vehicle in general, and thus Paul's audience would not have dwelt upon its implicative complex? For metaphors like "redemption" that are well-worn theological categories, if scholars began theological and exegetical inquiry by assessing the strength and resonance of the various occurrences of the metaphors they studied, they would be on firmer ground for arguing for or against a univocal Pauline sense for some words, depending on the strength or weakness of the vehicle in its various metaphorical contexts.

Taking an even more contentious example: if it can be demonstrated that δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) is a strong metaphor, then arguing for a univocal Pauline sense for this word makes little sense given how metaphors function. N. T. Wright recognizes a spectrum of meanings in Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness), and identifies four "layers of meaning" that he argues are all present in Paul's use of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness).¹ Perhaps Wright's observation points to evidence that δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) is a strong metaphor, but rather than speaking of the lexeme "δικαιοσύνη" possessing multiple layers of meaning, it would be more beneficial to examine various instances of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) metaphors, and to assess their meanings at the level of a complete utterance. However, it is also possible that δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) is a weak metaphor. If δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) metaphors do not invite Paul's readers to actively contemplate their implicative complexes, then it might be possible to suggest something more akin to a conventional word definition. Moreover, it is possible that the related term "δικαιοῦν" (to justify) is a more lively metaphor than δικαιοσύνη (righteousness), and that δικαιοῦν (to justify) conjures a robust implicative complex that asks the hearer to contemplate justification in terms of a forensic declaration. This step of the exegetical process cannot be assumed or taken for granted. Scholars must examine the various occurrences of the Pauline metaphors, carefully weighing the biblical and extra-biblical evidence to determine whether a metaphor is still "alive" and "novel" in the Pauline texts.

For those Pauline vehicles that are demonstrated to produce strong metaphors, scholars must begin their theological analysis by recognizing that the same vehicle can be used in different metaphors, resulting in different metaphorical meanings depending on the individual metaphorical utterance.

1 Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, vol. 2, 796.

Therefore, a rigorous study of a key Pauline vehicle (e.g., δικαιούν/to justify, ἀπολύτρωσις/redemption, and so forth) must begin by examining the spectrum of meanings, and resist synthesizing meanings into a univocal “meaning” that smooths out the ragged edges inherent in metaphors. For example, if metaphorical meaning lies at the level of utterance rather than lexeme, in the Pauline text we have, for example, δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) *metaphors* and not a single, univocal Pauline meaning of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness). Moreover, a synthesis of the Pauline justification metaphors should aim at coherence rather than harmonization, and should endeavor to preserve the distinct contributions of individual metaphors.

Intertextual Connections in Metaphorical Utterances

In this study, I have argued that intertextual connections in metaphorical utterances have the potential to evoke not only single texts, but might also evoke whole groups of texts where similar metaphors occur (e.g., texts that use sonship metaphors). Moreover, the precursor texts not only inform successive texts, but successive texts speak back to precursor texts, interpreting them and transforming them. Intertextual relationships are multidirectional, and thus precursor texts cannot be “added up” to arrive at the meaning of a metaphor in a particular Pauline context. Rather, care must be taken to recognize Paul’s unique voice in the intertextual landscape. Moreover, there are times when Paul might use a related vehicle (e.g., υἱοθεσία for sonship), and by doing so, create something that cannot be termed an “echo,” but rather his new lens constrains and reinterprets the group of texts he draws upon in his own “reflection.” However, I will acknowledge that instances of Pauline “reflections” might be rare phenomena. Yet, even where scholars can make more straightforward intertextual connections because a shared vehicle exists (e.g., δούλος/slave and עַבְד/servant in Deut 15:15; 24:18; Rom 6:16–18), scholars must recognize that metaphors with identical vehicles do not necessarily result in identical meanings. Here too, Paul’s unique voice must be preserved, and scholars must reckon with how Paul’s metaphor might speak back to, and transform, precursor texts.

This issue may seem benign for vehicles like δούλος, but the stakes might be higher when considering a metaphor like contentious metaphor like justification. Some of the debate over the meaning of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) in Paul centers on defining the lexeme based on Old Testament intertextual connections, or drawing upon the term’s legal meaning from the surrounding culture as the “general text.” However, Paul’s versions of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) metaphors are not only informed by precursor texts, but they also transform

these same precursor texts for Paul's readers. Thus the meanings present in precursor texts, especially Old Testament texts, cannot be used as evidence for one "meaning" of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) over and against another for the meaning of various δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) metaphors in Paul. Moreover, scholars must carefully consider the likelihood of Paul's audience making various intertextual connections, and realize that unless Paul explicitly quotes a text, different audience members are likely to make different intertextual connections. Thus when working with metaphorical vehicles, scholars should be wary of excluding intertextual connections prematurely, or focusing too narrowly on a single intertextual connection. Once intertextual connections have been carefully considered, scholars should endeavor to articulate how intertextual connections work within the Pauline metaphors, and how Paul's unique voice transforms these precursor texts.

Metaphor and Model in Pauline Theology

In addition to recognizing the metaphorical nature of key Pauline themes, and reckoning with the complexity of analyzing metaphors in intertextual relationships, it is paramount for biblical scholars to understand the nuanced relationship between a metaphor and its underlying model(s). As discussed in this study, there are three potential models present in each of Paul's υιοθεσία metaphors: Greek adoption, Roman adoption, and Jewish sonship. However, the meaning of each υιοθεσία metaphor cannot be determined by appealing to an underlying model, nor can we reduce a model to a conventional definition of a particular word. Rather, models flesh out a metaphor's implicative complex by importing information such as social conventions, political attitudes, legal information, religious connotations, and so on into the mental simulation of a metaphor's hearer. The subtle relationship between a metaphor and its underlying models urges scholars to consider carefully which model, or models, underlie a given metaphor in the biblical text. Once the potential models have been identified, scholars can begin to reflect on which models are most likely to be associated by the original audience, and what they import into the metaphor's implicative complex. Moreover, scholars must recognize that models may change from context to context, and the same vehicle may not evoke the same models in every occurrence.

Correlated with this, it is not uncommon to find mixed metaphors in theological synthesis. A mixed metaphor is an indication that the connection between a metaphor and its underlying model has been lost. For example, Francis Turretin explains adoption as "the bestowal of a right to life, flowing from Christ's righteousness, which acquired for us not only deliverance from

death, but also a right to life by the adoption with which he endows us.”² Turretin’s articulation of adoption bears no relationship to any of the underlying models of the υιοθεσία metaphors in Paul. If scholars do not use language appropriate to the underlying models in their theological syntheses, it is quite possible that metaphors that are lively and novel in the biblical text will meet their untimely “death” at the hands of well-intentioned exegetes. To guard against this, scholars should draw upon the underlying models for the terms they use to elucidate the meaning of metaphors in the biblical text.

Metaphor and Theological Categories

A final implication that this study’s methodology proffers Pauline scholars is that metaphors resist compartmentalization. Is υιοθεσία a soteriological metaphor? Is it an ecclesiological metaphor? Is it an eschatological metaphor? The answer is: all of the above, yet none of the above. As I have shown, the υιοθεσία metaphors in Paul at times emphasize vertical (soteric?) implications, and at times horizontal (ecclesiological?) implications come to the fore. It is unwise to attempt to fit the metaphors into one theological category, as implications that fall outside of a particular category are often lost or obscured from view. Instead, Pauline scholars must read each Pauline metaphor on its own terms, recognizing that the spectrum of meaning will often include implications from various theological categories. It is equally unwise and unhelpful to use one Pauline metaphor as a way of organizing another Pauline metaphor. For example, Vanhoozer, in his attempt to unify the emphases of N. T. Wright and John Piper, writes that “adoption . . . is the perfect mediating category”³ for differing views of justification. Vanhoozer’s desire to use “adoption” to capture two competing views of “justification” is commendable. However, using one metaphor to categorize the implicative complexes of another metaphor (or metaphors) ultimately obscures meanings of both sets of metaphors. Justification metaphors should be analyzed and discussed using vocabulary appropriate to their underlying models without appealing to the vocabulary of adoption as a way of explaining justification. Vanhoozer’s desire to encompass a wide spectrum of meanings for the Pauline justification metaphors speaks

2 Francis Turretin, *The Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, vol. 2, trans. G. M. Giger, ed. J. T. Dennison Jr. (Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 1994), 666.

3 Kevin Vanhoozer, “Wrighting the Wrongs of the Reformation: The State of the Union with Christ in St. Paul and Protestant Soteriology,” in *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, eds. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays (Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011), 254.

to the need for scholars to examine the various occurrences of δικαιοσύνη (righteousness) metaphors on their own terms, and to embrace a plurality of meanings for those metaphors. Perhaps a different methodological starting point will nudge the conversation surrounding Pauline justification ever so slightly forward.

Bibliography

- Aasgaard, Reidar. "My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!": *Christian Siblingship in Paul*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 265. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Abasciano, Brian J. "Corporate Election in Romans 9: A Reply to Tom Schreiner." *JETS* 49 (2006): 351–71.
- Abasciano, Brian J. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Romans 9.1–9: An Intertextual and Theological Exegesis*. Library of New Testament Studies 301. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Aletti, J. N. *Israël et la loi dans la lettre aux romains*. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Alkier, Stefan. "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Stefan Alkier, Richard B. Hays, and Leroy A. Huizenga, 3–21. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.
- Anderson, H. "3 Maccabees." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 509–530. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Aranda, Antonio. "Imagen de Dios en Christo—Hijos de Dios en Christo: Una Relectura de la Doctrina Antropológica Paulina." *Scripta Theologica* 39.1 (2007): 37–72.
- Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric*, trans. J. H. Freese. Loeb Classical Library 193. London: Heinemann, 1967.
- Aristotle. *Categories: On Interpretation*, trans. H. P. Cooke, and Hugh Tredennick. Loeb Classical Library 325. London: Heinemann, 1938.
- Arnold, Clinton. "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3, 9." *NovT* 38.1 (1996): 55–76.
- Asano, Atsuhiko. *Community-Identity Construction in Galatians: Exegetical, Social-Anthropological and Socio-Cultural Studies*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 285. London: T & T Clark, 2005.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. "On the Herodian Origin of Militant Davidic Messianism at Qumran: New Light from *Psalms of Solomon* 17." *JBL* 118.3 (1999): 435–60.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. "Towards a Redating of the Psalms of Solomon: Implications for Understanding the *Sitz im Leben* of an Unknown Jewish Sect." *JSP* 17 (1998): 95–112.
- Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Auzépy, Marie-France. "Campagne de prospection 2007 de la mission Marmara." *Anatolia Antiqua* 15 (2007): 342–43.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 33. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

- Barclay, John M. G. *Obedying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians*. Vancouver: Regent College Publications, 2005.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Barclay, John M. G. Review of *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*, by Stanley Stowers. *JTS* 46.2 (1995): 646–51.
- Barr, James. “‘Abba’ isn’t ‘Daddy.’” *JTS* 39 (1988): 28–47.
- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Barrett, C. K. *Epistle to the Romans*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962.
- Barsalou, L. W. “Perceptual Symbol Systems.” *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22 (1999): 577–609.
- Bassler, Jouette M. “Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans.” *NovT* 26.1 (1984): 43–58.
- Basson, Alec. *Divine Metaphors in Selected Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 11 15. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Bauckham, Richard. “The Story of the Earth according to Paul: Rom 8:18–23.” *RevExp* 108 (2011): 91–97.
- Baum, L. Frank. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Chicago: George M. Hill Company, 1900.
- Baur, F. C. “Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes und die damit Zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde.” In *Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben: Historisch-Kritische Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 1, ed. Klaus Scholder, 147–266. Stuttgart: Fromman, 1963.
- Beale, Gregory K. “The Background of *ἐκκλησία* Revisited.” *JSNT* 38.2 (2015): 151–168.
- Beardsley, Monroe. “The Metaphorical Twist.” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 22 (1962): 293–307.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. “The Faithfulness of God and the Priority of Israel in Paul's Letter to the Romans.” *HTR* 79 (1986): 10–16.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. “Suffering and Triumph in Paul's Letter to the Romans.” *HBT* 7.2 (1985): 105–119.
- Becker, Jürgen. “Der Brief an die Galater.” In *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Philipper, Kolosser, Thessalonicher und Philemon*, 1–85. Das Neue Testament Deutsch 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985.
- Bergen, Benjamin K. *Louder than Words: The New Science of How the Mind Makes Meaning*. New York: Basic Books, 2012.
- Bergen, Benjamin K., and Kathryn Wheeler. “Sentence Understanding Engages Motor Processes.” In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 2005.

- Belleville, Linda. "'Under Law': Structural Analysis and the Pauline Concept of Law in Galatians 3:21–4:11." *JSNT* 26 (1986): 53–78.
- Belth, Marc. *The Process of Thinking*. New York: David McKay, 1977.
- Berkely, Bill. "Sounds of Violence: Rwanda's Killer Radio." *New Republic* 211 (1994): 18–19.
- Berner, Christoph. *Die Exoduserzählung: das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Bird, Michael. *The Saving Righteousness of God*. London: Paternoster, 2007.
- Black, Max. "More About Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 19–41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell, 1962.
- The Bloody Theater or Martyrs Mirror of the Defenseless Christians*. Scottdale, PA: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951.
- Blum, Erhard. "Psalm 2,7c—eine performative Aussage." In *Sefer Rendtorff: Festschrift zum 50sten Geburtstag von Rolf Rendtorff*, ed. Konrad Rupprecht, 4–8. Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche 1. Dielheim: Self-published by authors, 1975.
- Boecker, Hans Jochen. "Anmerkungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament." *ZAW* 86.1 (1974): 86–89.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. *Galatians*. New Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2011.
- Boer, Martinus C. de Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* by Mark Nanos. *BibInt* 12.4 (2004): 421–24.
- Boers, Hendrikus. *Theology Out of the Ghetto: A New Testament Exegetical Study Concerning Religious Exclusiveness*. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Booth, Wayne C. "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation." In *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks, 47–70. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Bornet, Gérard. "Metapher: (Denk-) Anstoss zum Sprachwandel Bemerkungen zum Beitrag von Louise Röska-Hardy." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 151–57. Bern: Haupt, 1995.
- Boyarín, Daniel. "Was Paul an 'Anti-Semite?': A Reading of Galatians 3–4." *USQR* 47 (1993): 47–80.
- Branick, Vincent P. "Apocalyptic Paul?" *CBQ* 47.4 (1985): 664–75.
- Brawley, Robert L. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995.

- Brettler, Marc Zvi. *God Is King: Understanding an Israelite Metaphor*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 76. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 38. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Broich, Ulrich. "Formen der Markierung von Intertextualität." In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 31–47. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Broich, Ulrich. "Bezugsfelder der Intertextualität: Zur Einzeltextreferenz." In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 48–52. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Brown, Michael J. "Paul's use of ΔΟΥΛΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ in Romans 1:1." *JBL* 120.4 (2001): 723–37.
- Brown, R. E., and John P. Meier, *Antioch and Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity*. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- Bueggemann, Walter. *Deuteronomy*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001.
- Burchard, C. "Joseph and Aseneth." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 177–248. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Burke, Kenneth. *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.
- Burke, Trevor. *Adopted into God's Family: Exploring a Pauline Metaphor*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 22. Downers Grove: IVP, 2006.
- Burke, Trevor. "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8." *EvQ* 70 (1998): 311–24.
- Burke, Trevor. "Adopted as Sons (ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ): The Missing Piece in Pauline Soteriology." In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley Porter, 259–87. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Burke, Trevor. "Pauline Adoption: A Sociological Approach." *EvQ* 73 (2001): 119–34.
- Burke, Trevor. *The Message of Sonship: At Home in God's Household*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2011.
- Burkett, Delbert. *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation*. Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Burri, Alex. "Metaphern, Modelle und wissenschaftliche Erklärungen." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 268–89. Bern: Haupt, 1995.
- Buscemi, Alfio Marcello. "Libertà e Huiiothesia: Studio Esetico di Gal 4,1–7." *LA* 30 (1980): 93–136.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Byrne, Brendan. "Sons of God"—"Seed of Abraham": A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background. *Analecta Biblica* 83. Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1979.

- Bytwerk, Randall L. "The Argument for Genocide in Nazi Propaganda." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 91.1 (2005): 37–62.
- Campbell, Douglas. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Campbell, Douglas. "The Story of Jesus in Romans and Galatians." In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 97–124. Louisville: WJK, 2002.
- Campbell, William S. "The Addressees of Paul's Letter to the Romans." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 171–95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Casey, Maurice. *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1979.
- Cassius, Dio Cocceianus. *Roman History*, 9 vols., trans. Earnest Carey. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1914–1927.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Cheon, Samuel. *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 23. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Chesnutt, Randall D. "The Social Setting and Purpose of Joseph and Aseneth." *JSP* 2 (1988): 21–48.
- Childs, Brevard. *Exodus: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1974.
- Childs, Brevard. *Isaiah*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2001.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *The Speeches: Pro Archia poeta, Post reditum in Senatu, Post reditum ad Quirites, De domo sua, De haruspicum responsis, Pro Plancio*, trans. N. H. Watts. Loeb Classical Library 158. London: Heinemann, 1923.
- Cisneros, J. David. "Contaminated Communities: The Metaphor of 'Immigrant as Pollutant' in Media Representations of Immigration." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 11.4 (2008): 569–601.
- Clark, Herbert H. *Using Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Coggins, Richard. "A Future for the Commentary?" In *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies*, ed. Francis Watson, 163–75. London: SCM Press, 1993.
- Cohen, Anthony P. *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Tavistock, 1985.
- Cohen, Ted. "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy." In *On Metaphor*, ed. Sheldon Sacks, 1–10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Cohen, Ted. "Some Philosophy: 1." *Raritan* 10.2 (1990): 30–45.
- Cohen, Ted. *Thinking of Others: On the Talent for Metaphor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Origin of the Designation of Jesus as 'Son of Man.'" *HTR* 80 (1987): 391–408.

- Collins, Adela Yarbro, and John J. Collins. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Collins, John J. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK Press, 1997.
- Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Collins, John J. "The Son of God Text from Qumran." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer, 65–82. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Collins, Raymond. *The Power of Images in Paul*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008.
- Cook, James I. "The Concept of Adoption in the Theology of Paul." In *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honor of Richard C. Oudersluys*, ed. Brendan Byrne, 133–44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Cooke, G. "The Israelite King as Son of God." *ZAW* 35 (1964): 22–47.
- Corley, Kathleen. "Women's Inheritance Rights in Antiquity and Paul's Metaphor of Adoption." In *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine, 98–121. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press, 2004.
- Corstan, Thomas. "Zu Inschriften aus Kleinasien." *EA* 37 (2004): 107–114.
- Craghan, John F. "Esther, Judith, and Ruth: Paradigms for Human Liberation." *BTB* 12 (1982): 11–19.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1990.
- Cranford, Michael. "Election and Ethnicity: Paul's View of Israel in Romans 9:1–13." *JSNT* 50 (1993): 27–41.
- Curc6, Carmen. "On Mosquitoes and Camels: Some Notes on the Interpretation of Metaphorically Transparent Popular Sayings." In *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz, 283–307. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.
- Dahl, Nils. "Christ, Creation, and the Church." In *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, 422–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Dahl, Nils. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1977.
- Danneberg, Luz, Andreas Graeser, and Klaus Petrus. "Metapher und Innovation." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 9–21. Bern: Haupt, 1995.
- Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- Das, A. Andrew. *Paul and the Stories of Israel: Grand Thematic Narratives in Galatians*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.
- Davidson, Donald. "What Metaphors Mean." In *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th ed., ed. A. P. Martinich, 473–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Davidson, Ivor. "Salvation's Destiny: Heirs of God." In *God of Salvation: Soteriology in Theological Perspective*, ed. Ivor J. Davidson and Murray A. Rae, 155–75. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2011.
- Davies, Glenn N. *Faith and Obedience in Romans*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 39. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
- Davies, W. D. Review of *Galatians*, by Hans Dieter Betz. *RelSRev* 7.4 (1981): 310–18.
- Dawes, Gregory W. *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21–33*. Biblical Interpretation 30. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Day, Linda. "Faith, Character, and Perspective in Judith." *JSOT* 95 (2001): 71–93.
- Dayton, Wilber T. "The New Testament Conception of Flesh." *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 2.1 (1967): 7–17.
- Debord, Pierre. "Religion et Soci  t  : Les F  tes D'H  cate et de Zeus    Stratonicee de Carie." In *Espaces et Pouvoirs dans l'Antiquit   de l'Anatolie    la Gaule*, ed. Julie Dalaison, 239–50. Grenoble: CRHIPA, 2007.
- Demosthenes. *Private Orations XLI–XLIX*, trans. A. T. Murray. Loeb Classical Library 346. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Derrida, Jacques. "The White Mythology: Metaphor in the Text of Philosophy," trans. F. C. T. Moore. *New Literary History* 6 (1974): 5–74.
- Desai, R. H., J. R. Binder, L. L. Conant, Q. R. Mano, and M. S. Seidenberg. "The Neural Career of Sensorimotor Metaphors." *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 23 (2012): 2376–2386.
- DeSilva, David. *Seeing Things John's Way: The Rhetoric of the Book of Revelation*. Louisville: WJK, 2009.
- Dillon, Richard. "The Spirit as Taskmaster." *CBQ* 60.4 (1998): 682–702.
- Diodorus of Sicily. *XXI–XXXII*, trans. Francis R. Walton. Loeb Classical Library 409. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Dixon, Suzanne. *The Roman Family*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: An Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1989.
- Dunn, James D. G. Did Paul Have a Covenant Theology?: Reflections of Romans 9:4 and 11:27." In *Celebrating Romans: Template for Pauline Theology*, ed. Sheila E. McGinn, 3–19. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A & C Black, 1993.

- Dunn, James D. G. *Jesus and the Spirit*. London: SCM Press, 1975.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*, 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Spirit Speech: Reflections on Romans 8:12–27." In *Romans & the People of God*, eds. Sven K. Soderlund, and N. T. Wright, 82–91. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. *Essene Writings from Qumran*, trans. Géza Vermes. Oxford: Blackwell, 1961.
- Durham, Deborah, and James W. Fernandez. "Tropical Dominions: The Figurative Struggle over Domains of Belonging and Apartness in Africa." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 190–212. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Eastman, Susan. "Israel and the Mercy of God: A Re-reading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9–11." *NTS* 56 (2010): 367–95.
- Eastman, Susan. "Whose Apocalypse: The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19." *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 263–77.
- Eckhardt, Benedikt. "Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonian Politics." *JSP* 18 (2009): 243–63.
- Edwards, Elizabeth Gordon. "Exploring the Implications of Paul's Use of *Sarx* (Flesh)." In *Biblical Ethics & Homosexuality: Listening to Scripture*, ed. Robert Brawley, 69–75. Louisville: WJK, 1996.
- Eliot, T. S. *The Complete Poems and Plays: 1900–1950*. New York: Harcourt, 1971.
- Elliott, Neil. *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 45. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Embry, Brad. "The *Psalms of Solomon* and the New Testament: Intertextuality and the Need for a Re-Evaluation." *JSP* 13 (2002): 99–136.
- Epp, Eldon. "Jewish-Gentile Continuity in Paul: Torah and/or Faith? (Romans 9:1–5)." *HTR* 79 (1986): 80–90.
- Erickson, Millard. *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013.
- Eyben, Emiel. "Fathers and Sons." In *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, ed. Beryl Rawson, 106–43. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Fahy, T. "St. Paul's Romans Were Jewish Converts." *ITQ* 26 (1959): 182–91.
- Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner. "Rethinking Metaphor." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., 53–66. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Fee, Gordon. *Galatians: A Pentecostal Commentary*. Pentecostal Commentary Series, Dorset: Deo Publishing, 2007.

- Fee, Gordon. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Fee, Gordon. "Who are Abraham's True Children? The Role of Abraham in Pauline Argumentation." In *Perspectives on Our Father Abraham*, ed. Stephen Hunt, 126–37. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Feldman, Louis. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard. "Vater und Töpfer: Zur Identität Gottes in Römerbrief." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 377–90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Fernandez, James W., ed. *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Ferré, Frederick. "Metaphors, Models, and Religion." *Soundings* 51.3 (1968): 327–45.
- Firth, Simon. "Music and Identity." In *Questions of Cultural Identity*, eds. S. Hall and P. du Gay, 108–125. London: Sage, 1996.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The One Who Is To Come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Fowl, Stephen. "Who Can Read Abraham's Story?: Allegory and Interpretive Power in Galatians." *JSNT* 55 (1994): 77–95.
- Fung, Ronald Y. K. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Gallese, V., and L. Fadiga, L. Fogassi, G. Rizzolatti. "Action Recognition in the Premotor Cortex." *Brain: A Journal of Neurology* 119 (1996): 593–609.
- Garner, David B. "Adoption in Christ." Westminster Theological Seminary: Ph.D. Diss., 2002.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "Neither Height nor Depth: Discerning the Cosmology of Romans." *JSJ* 64.3 (2011): 265–78.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "On the Calling-Into-Being of Israel: Romans 9:6–29." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 255–69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *Our Mother Saint Paul*. Louisville: WJK, 2007.
- Getty, Mary Ann. "Paul on the Covenants and the Future of Israel." *BTB* 17 (1987): 92–99.
- Gheorghita, Radu. *The Role of the Septuagint in Hebrews: An Investigation of Its Influence with Special Consideration to the Use of Hab 2:3–4 in Heb 10:37–38*. Wissenschaftlich Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II 160. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Gianoulis, George C. "Is Sonship in Romans 8:14–17 a Link with Romans 9?" *BSac* 166 (2009): 70–83.

- Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr. "Metaphor Interpretation as Embodied Simulation." *Mind & Language* 21.3 (2006): 434–58.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr. *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. Jr., and Teenie Matlock. "Metaphor, Imagination, and Simulation: Psycholinguistic Evidence." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., 161–176. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Glucksberg, Sam, and Boaz Keysar. "How Metaphors Work." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 401–24. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Godet, Frederic. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1977.
- Goodrich, John K. "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4.1–2." *JSNT* 32.3 (2010): 251–84.
- Gourgues, Michel. "La 'plénitude des temps,' ou le temps marqué de façon décisive par la référence à Jésus Christ. Polysémie d'une formule néotestamentaire (Mc 1,15; Ga 4,4; Ep 1,10)." *Science et Esprit* 53.1 (2001): 93–110.
- Gray, Allison. *Psalm 118 in Words and Pictures*. Biblical Interpretation 127. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Gregg, J. A. F. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. *The Crux of Election: Paul's Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament: Series II 202. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Grothe, Mardy. *i never metaphor I didn't like: a comprehensive compilation of history's greatest analogies, metaphors, and similes*. New York: Harper, 2008.
- Grudem, Wayne. "Does κεφαλή ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples." *Trinity Journal* 6 (1985): 38–59.
- Grudem, Wayne. "The Meaning of κεφαλή ('Head'): A Response to Recent Studies." *Trinity Journal* 11 (1990): 3–72.
- Grudem, Wayne. *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Grzybek, Erhard. "Rhodische Inschriften." *ZPE* 165 (2008): 72–73.
- Gupta, Nijay. "Towards a Set of Principles for Identifying and Interpreting Metaphors in Paul: ΠΙΠΟΣΑΓΩΓΗ (Romans 5:2) as a Test Case." *ResQ* 51.3 (2009): 169–81.
- Gupta, Nijay. *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 175. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Haacker, Klaus. "Das Thema von Römer 9–11 als Problem der Auslegungsgeschichte." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 55–72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

- Haacker, Klaus. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006.
- Hallo, W. W. "Proverbs Quoted in Epic." In *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran*, ed. Tzvi Abusch, John Huehnergard, Piotr Steinkeller, 203–17. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Hallof, Klaus, ed. *Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icarique*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003.
- Hann, Robert. "The Community of the Pious: the Social Setting of the *Psalms of Solomon*." *SR* 17 (1988): 169–89.
- Hansen, G. Walter. *Abraham in Galatians: Epistolary and Rhetorical Contexts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Hanson, Paul. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *JBL* 96.2 (1977): 195–233.
- Hanson, Paul. *Galatians*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP 2004.
- Harrison, A. R. W. *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Hays, Christopher. "Echoes of the Ancient Near East?: Intertextuality and the Comparative Study of the Old Testament." In *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, eds. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb, 20–43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Hays, Richard. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Essays on Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hays, Richard. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Hays, Richard. "Is Paul's Gospel Narratable?" *JSNT* 27.2 (2004): 217–39.
- Hays, Richard. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hays, Richard. "Forward to the English Edition." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga, xi–xv. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Heaton, E. W. "The Root שֹׂאֵר and the Doctrine of the Remnant." *JTS* 3.1 (1952): 27–39.
- Heen, Erik. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. *JBL* 121.2 (2002): 376–78.
- Heim, Erin. "Paths Beyond Tracing Out: The Hermeneutics of Metaphor and Theological Method." In *The Voice of God in the Text of Scripture*, eds. Oliver Crips, and Fred Sanders, 112–126. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
- Hengel, Martin. "Abba, Maranatha, Hosanna und die Anfänge der Christologie." In *Denkwürdiges Geheimnis: Beiträge zur Gotteslehre: Festschrift für Eberhard Jüngel*

- zum 70. Geburtstag, eds. Ingolf U. Dalferth, Johannes Fischer, Hans-Peter Grosshans, 145–83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols., trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1974.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1976.
- Herrin, Elaine. "Hello, 'Daddy, God'; Goodbye, Dignity: If You Really Love Jesus Don't Honk." *Christianity Today* 28.12 (1984): 88.
- Herrmann, Peter. *New Documents from Lydia*. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2007.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, ed. Noel Malcolm. Oxford: Clarendon, 2011.
- Hodge, Caroline E. Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Holladay, William. *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah, chapters 26–52*, ed. Paul D. Hanson. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Holladay, William. *Jeremiah: Spokesman Out of Time*. Philadelphia: Pilgrim, 1974.
- Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Holt, L. E., and S. L. Beilock. "Expertise and Its Embodiment: Examining the Impact of Sensorimotor Skill Expertise on the Representation of Action-Related Text." *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 13 (2006): 694–701.
- Holthuis, Susanne. *Intertextualität: Aspekte einer rezeptionsorientierten Konzeption*. Stauffenburg Colloquium 28. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1993.
- Hooker, Morna D. *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Hooker, Morna D. "'Heirs of Abraham': The Gentiles' Role in Israel's Story: A Response to Bruce W. Longenecker." In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 85–96. Louisville: WJK, 2002.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Interchange in Christ and Ethics." *JSNT* 25 (1985): 3–17.
- Horbury, William. "Messianism in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. John Day, 402–433. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 270. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998.
- Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Kyrios und Pneuma bei Paulus." In *Paulinische Christologie: exegetische Beiträge: Hans Hübner zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Udo Schnelle, and Thomas Söding, 59–75. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Horton, William S. "Metaphor and Readers' Attributions of Intimacy." *Memory & Cognition* 35.1 (2007): 87–94.
- Howe, Bonnie. *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter*. Biblical Interpretation 81. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

- Howgego, Christopher. *Ancient History from Coins*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Huebner, Sabine R. "‘Brother-Sister’ Marriage in Roman Egypt: A Curiosity of Humankind or a Widespread Family Strategy." *JRS* 97 (2007): 27–40.
- Hugo, Victor. *Les Misérables*, trans. Charles E. Wilbour. New York: Knopf, 1998.
- Hurtado, Larry. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Hurtado, Larry, and Paul Owen, eds. "Who is This Son of Man?": *The Latest Scholarship on a Puzzling Expression of the Historical Jesus*. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Isaeus. Trans. Edward Seymour Forster. Loeb Classical Library 202. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Jackson, Dave, and Neta Jackson. *On Fire for Christ: Stories of Anabaptist Martyrs*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1989.
- Jankovic, Rachel. *Loving the Little Years: Motherhood in the Trenches*. Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2010.
- Jegher-Bucher, Verena. *Der Galaterbrief auf dem Hintergrund antiker Epistolographie und Rhetorik: ein anderes Paulusbild*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 78. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1991.
- Jenkins, Richard. *Social Identity*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Central Message of the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1965.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *New Testament Theology*, trans. John Bowden. London: SCM, 1971.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Prayers of Jesus*, trans. John Bowden, Christoph Burchard, and John Reumann. Studies in Biblical Theology: Series 11 6. London: SCM, 1967.
- Jewett, Paul K. "The Holy Spirit as Female?" *Reformed Journal* 28.4 (1978): 10–12.
- Jewett, Robert. "The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans." *Int* 39.4 (1985): 341–56.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Johnson, Mark. "Philosophy's Debt to Metaphor." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., 39–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Johnson, Joel T. and Shelley E. Taylor. "The Effect of Metaphor on Political Attitudes." *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 2 (1981): 305–316.
- Jonge, Marinus de. *Jesus, the Servant Messiah*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Joseph, Simon S. "Seek His Kingdom": Q 12, 22b–31, God's Providence, and Adamic Wisdom." *Bib* 92.3 (2011): 392–410.
- Josephus, Flavius. *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray. Loeb Classical Library 242. London: Heinemann, 1930.
- Jüncker, Gunther. "‘Children of Promise’: Spiritual Paternity and Patriarch Typology in Galatians and Romans." *BBR* 17.1 (2007): 131–60.

- Kaiser, Otto. "Covenant and Law in Ben Sira." In *Covenant as Context: Essays in Honour of E. W. Nicholson*, eds. A. D. H. Mayes and R. B. Salters, 235–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Kahl, Brigitte. *Galatians Re-Imagined: Reading with the Eyes of the Vanquished*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian. "Die Prädikation Jesu Christi als 'Gott' und die paulinische Christologie: Erwägungen zur Exegese von Röm 9,5b." *ZNW* 94.3–4 (2003): 164–80.
- Kaschak, M. P., C. J. Madden, D. J. Theriault, R. H. Yaxley, M. E. Aveyard, A. A. Blanchard, and R. A. Zwaan. "Perception of Motion Affects Language Processing." *Cognition* 94 (2005): B79–B89.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kaser, Max. *Das Römische Privatrecht: Das Altrömische, das Vorklassische und Klassische Recht*, vol. 1. Munich: Beck, 1971.
- Katz, Albert N. "Preface." In *Figurative Language Comprehension: Social and Cultural Influences*, eds. Herbert L. Colston, and Albert N. Katz, ix–xi. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia. "Exodus and the Intertextual Transformation of Tradition in Romans 8:14–30." *JSNT* 54 (1994): 29–56.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia. *Paul and His Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Kim, Johann D. *God, Israel, and the Gentiles: Rhetoric and Situation in Romans 9–11*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 176. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000.
- Kirchner, Johannes, ed. *Inscriptiones atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*. 4 vols. Inscriptiones Graecae. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1913–1940.
- Kirk, J. R. Daniel. "Appointed Son(s): An Exegetical Note on Romans 1:4 and 8:29." *BBR* 14.2 (2004): 241–42.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Köller, Wilhelm. *Semiotik und Metapher: Untersuchungen zur grammatischen Struktur und kommunikativen Funktion von Metapher*. Studien zur allgemeinen und vergleichenden Literaturwissenschaft 10. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche, 1975.
- Kooten, George H. van. "Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies." *NTS* 58.4 (2012): 522–48.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Kövecses, Zoltán. "Metaphor and Emotion." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., 380–396. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

- Kövecses, Zoltán. *Metaphor and Emotion: Language, Culture, and Body in Human Feeling*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Kraemer, Ross Shepard. *When Aseneth Met Joseph: A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Kraftchick, Steven. "Paul's Use of Creation Themes: A Test of Romans 1–8." *ExAud* 3 (1987): 72–87.
- Kremers, Heinz. "Das jüdische Volk ist noch immer "Israel"—Volk Gottes: Eine Auslegung von Röm 9,1–5." In *Mission an Israel in heilsgeschichtlicher Sicht*, eds. Heinz Kremers, and Erich Lubahn, 37–48. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.
- Krieger, Norbert. "Zum Römerbrief." *NovT* 3.1 (1959): 146–48.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, ed. Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Kristeva, Julia. *La révolution du langage poétique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Narration et Transformation." *Semiotica* 1 (1969): 422–48.
- Kroeger, Catherine Clark. "The Classical Concept of 'Head' as 'Source.'" In *Equal to Serve*, ed. Gretchen Gaebelein Hull, 267–83. London: Scripture Union, 1987.
- Kuiken, Don, (et al.). "Locating Self-Modifying Feelings within Literary Readings." *Discourse Processes* 38.2 (2004): 267–86.
- Kunst, Christiane. *Römische Adoption: Zur Strategie einer Familienorganisation*. Frankfurter althistorische Beiträge 10. Hennef: Marthe Clauss, 2005.
- Kurylowicz, Marek. *Die Adoptio im klassischen römischen Recht*. Studia Antiqua. Warsaw: University of Warszawskiego, 1981.
- Lakoff, George. "The Neural Theory of Metaphor." In *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*, ed. Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., 17–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*, 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Turner. *More Than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lampe, Peter. *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*, trans. Michael Steinhauser, ed. Marshall D. Johnson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Lanham, Richard. *Analyzing Prose*, 2nd ed. London: Continuum, 2003.
- Lewis, Robert Brian. *Paul's "Spirit of Adoption" in Its Roman Imperial Context*. Library of New Testament Studies 545. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- Lietzmann, H. "Zwei Notizen zu Paulus." *SPAW* 8 (1930): 151–56.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 10th ed. London: MacMillan, 1890.
- Lindsay, Shane. "Visual Priming of Language Comprehension." M. A. Thesis, 2003. University of Sussex: Brighton, UK.

- Lindsay, Shane. "Perceptuomotor Processing in Language Comprehension." Ph.D. Diss., 2008. University of Sussex: Brighton, UK.
- Liubinskas, Susann. "Identification by Spirit Alone: Community-Identity Construction in Galatians 3:19–4:7." *AsTJ* 67.1 (2012): 27–55.
- Llamas, Carmen, and Dominic Watt, eds. *Language and Identities*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Locke, John. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. Peter H. Nidditch. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Løland, Hanne. *Silent or Salient Gender?: The Interpretation of Gendered God-Language in the Hebrew Bible Exemplified in Isaiah 42, 46, and 49*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 11 32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Longenecker, Bruce. "Different Answers to Different Issues: Israel, the Gentiles and Salvation History in Romans 9–11." *JSNT* 36 (1989): 95–123.
- Longenecker, Bruce. "Sharing in Their Spiritual Blessings?: The Stories of Israel in Galatians and Romans." In *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker, 58–84. Louisville: WJK, 2002.
- Longenecker, Bruce. *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2016.
- Louw, J. P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Lowry, James W. "The Martyrs' Mirror: A Mirror of Nonresistance." *Mennonite Life* 45.3 (1990): 36–44.
- Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah 21–36*. Anchor Bible Commentary. New York: Doubleday, 2004.
- Lüttger, Wilhelm. *Gesetz und Geist: Eine Untersuchung zur Vorgeschichte des Galaterbriefs*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 22. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1919.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie 49. Munich: Kaiser, 1968.
- Lyall, Francis. "Roman Law in the Writings of Paul: Adoption." *JBL* 88 (1969): 458–66.
- Lyall, Francis. *Slaves, Citizens, Sons: Legal Metaphors in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1984.
- Maartens, P. J. "Inference and Relevance in Paul's Allegory of the Wild Olive Tree." *HvTSt* 53.4 (1997): 1000–1029.
- Macky, Peter. *The Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990.

- Malay, Hasan, and Marijana Ricl. "Some Funerary Inscriptions from Lydia." *EA* 39 (2006): 71 no. 45.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *The Letters to the Thessalonians*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Marböck, Johannes. "Sir 38, 24–39, 11: Der schriftgelehrt Weise." In *La Sagesse de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. M. Gilbert, 293–316. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.
- Marshall, I. Howard. "Living in the 'Flesh.'" *BSac* 159 (2002): 387–403.
- Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- Martinich, A. P. "A Theory for Metaphor." In *The Philosophy of Language*, 5th Ed., ed. A. P. Martinich, 485–96. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "A Law-Observant Mission to the Gentiles: The Background of Galatians." *SJT* 38.3 (1985): 307–24.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Martyn, J. Louis. "Paul and His Jewish-Christian Interpreters." *USQR* 42 (1988): 1–15.
- Matera, Frank. *Galatians*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Mawhinney, Allen. "God as Father: Two Popular Theories Reconsidered." *JETS* 31.2 (1988): 181–89.
- Mawhinney, Allen. "Huiiothesia in the Pauline Epistles: Its Background, Use, and Implications." Ph.D. Diss., Baylor University, 1982.
- Mayes, A. D. H. "Deuteronomy 14 and the Deuteronomic Worldview." In *Studies in Deuteronomy: In Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. F. García Martínez, et. al., 165–81. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- McConville, J. G. *Deuteronomy*. Apollos Old Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos, 2002.
- McFague, Sallie. *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Meinhold, Arndt. "Gott und Mensch in Proverbien III." *VT* 37.4 (1987): 468–77.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Asking Back to Jesus' Identity." In *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer, 38–50. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Mettinger, Tryggve N. D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series 8. Lund: Gleerup, 1976.
- Miall, David S., and Don Kuiken. "A Feeling for Fiction: Becoming What We Behold." *Poetics* 30 (2002): 221–41.
- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Römer*, 4th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

- Middendorp, Theophil. *Die Stellung Jesus Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Mitchell, Jon. "Identity." In *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, eds. Alan Barnard, and Jonathan Spencer, 368–69. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis, 2010.
- Mitchell, Stephen. *Anatolia: Land, Men, and Gods*, 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Mitchell, Stephen. *Regional Epigraphic Catalogues of Asia Minor II: The Ankara District, the Inscriptions of North Galatia*. British Institute of Archeology at Ankara Monograph 4. Oxford: B. A. R. 1982.
- Moffat, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1933.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John*. Sacra Pagina. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1989.
- Montefiore, Claude G. *The Old Testament and After*. London: Macmillan, 1923.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1996.
- Moore, Carey. *Judith*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1985.
- Morgan, Gareth. *Images of Organizations*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel of John*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *He That Cometh: The Messiah Concept in Israel and Later Judaism*, trans. G. W. Anderson. Nashville: Abingdon, 1956.
- Moyise, Steve. "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament." In *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, eds. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, Leroy A. Huizenga, 23–32. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Müller-Richter, Klaus, and Arturo Larcati. *Kampf der Metapher!* Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 634. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- Munck, Johannes. *Christ and Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9–11*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1959.
- Mundhenk, Norman. "Adoption: Being Recognized as Son." *BT* 59.4 (2008): 169–78.
- Murray, John. *Collected Writings of John Murray*, 2 vols. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2 vols. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965.
- Mussner, Franz. *Galaterbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.

- Nanos, Mark. *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.
- Nanos, Mark. "The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans." *CBQ* 61.2 (1999): 283–304.
- Nanos, Mark. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Nanos, Mark. "What Was at Stake in Peter's 'Eating with Gentiles' at Antioch?" In *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark Nanos, 300–16. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Nelson, Richard. *Deuteronomy*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: WJK, 2002.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
- Neusner, Jacob. *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism*, 2nd ed. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
- Nickelsburg, George. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11." *JBL* 96.3 (1977): 383–405.
- Nickelsburg, George. *1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. "'Nicht alle aus Israel sind Israel' (Röm 9,6b): Römer 9–11 als Zeugnis paulinischer Anthropologie." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilks, and J. Ross Wagner, 433–62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense." In *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. and trans. Walter Kaufmann, 46–47. New York: Penguin Books, 1982.
- Nigro, G., and U. Neisser. "Point of View in Personal Memories." *Cognitive Psychology* 15 (1983): 467–82.
- Oakes, Peter. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. *JSS* 49.1 (2004): 165–67.
- O'Brien, Gerald V. "Metaphors and the Pejorative Framing of Marginalized Group: Implications for Social Work Education." *Journal of Social Work Education* 45.1 (2009): 29–46.
- O'Dell, Jerry. "The Religious Background of the Psalms of Solomon (Re-evaluated in the Light of the Qumran Texts)." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 241–57.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko. "Embedding and Transforming Poly trope: The Monkey as Self in Japanese Culture." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 159–89. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Omanson, Roger L. *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament: An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the needs of Translators*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Ortony, Andrew, Gerald Clore, and Alan Collins. *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Orwell, George. *Essays*, ed. John Carey. Everyman's Library. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002.

- Osborne, Grant. *Romans*. IVP New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: IVP, 2004.
- Overland, Paul. "Did the Sage Draw from the Shema? A Study of Proverbs 3:1–12." *CBQ* 62 (2000): 424–40.
- Parker, Trent S., and Karen S. Wampler. "Changing Emotion: The Use of Therapeutic Storytelling." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 32.2 (2006): 155–66.
- Pascal, Blaise. *The Pensées*, trans. J. M. Cohen. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1961.
- Pasoli, Elio. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*. Bologna: Zuffi, 1950.
- Pecher, D., R. Zeelen, and L. W. Barsalou, "Verifying Different Modality Properties for Concepts Produces Switching Costs," *Psychological Science* 14 (2003): 119–124.
- Peppard, Michael. "Adopted and Begotten Sons of God: Paul and John on Divine Sonship." *CBQ* 73 (2011): 92–110.
- Peppard, Michael. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Pesch, Rudolf. *Römerbrief*. Neue Echter Bibel 6. Würzburg: Echter, 1994.
- Pfister, Manfred. "Konzepte der Intertextualität." In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 1–30. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Philo of Alexandria. *Philo*, trans. F. H. Colson, vol. 6. Loeb Classical Library 289. London: Heinemann, 1966.
- Piper, John. "'The Frank and Manly Mr. Ryle': The Value of a Masculine Ministry." *JBMW* 17.1 (2012): 10–22.
- Piper, John. *The Future of Justification*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007.
- Plutarch. *Moralia*, 14 vols., trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, et. al. Loeb Classical Library. New York: Heinemann, 1927–2004.
- Porter, Stanley, ed. *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Powery, Emerson. "'The Groans of 'Brother Saul': An Exploratory Reading of Romans 8 for 'Survival.'" *WW* 24.3 (2004): 315–22.
- Quesnel, Michel. "La Figure de la Mort Dans L'Épître aux Romains: Fonction Rhétorique et Argumentative." In *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, 55–73. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Quinn, Naomi. "The Cultural Basis of Metaphor." In *Beyond Metaphor: The Theory of Tropes in Anthropology*, ed. James W. Fernandez, 56–93. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Quintilian. *Institutio Oratio*, trans. H. E. Butler. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1920–1922.
- Rad, Gerhard von. *Deuteronomy*, trans. Dorothea Barton. Abingdon Old Testament Commentary. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.

- Reasoner, Mark. "Romans 9–11 Moves from Margin to Center, from Rejection to Salvation: Four Grids for Recent English-Language Exegesis." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 73–89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Reddy, Michael J. "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 164–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Reinbold, Wolfgang. "Zur Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Israel' in Römer 9–11." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 401–416. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Rey, Bernard. "Vie de foi et vie filiale selon Saint Paul." *MSRel* 39.1 (1982): 3–18.
- Richards, I. A. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Ricl, Marijana. "Varia Epigraphica." *EA* 35 (2002): 102–112.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *The Rule of Metaphor: Multi-disciplinary Studies of the Creation of Meaning in Language*, trans. Robert Czerny. London: Routledge, 1978.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*, trans. John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Ridderbos, Herman. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Riesner, Rainer. *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus: Studien zur Chronologie, Missionstrategie und Theologie*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 71. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1994.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "Interpretation and Undecidability." *New Literary History* 12.2 (1981): 227–42.
- Ritchie, L. David, and Char Schell. "'The Ivory Tower' on an 'Unstable Foundation': Playful Language, Humor, and Metaphor in the Negotiation of Scientists' Identities." *Metaphor and Symbol* 24.2 (2009): 90–104.
- Roetzel, Calvin. "Διὰ θεῶν καὶ in Romans 9:4." *Bib* 51 (1970): 377–90.
- Ropes, James H. *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians*. Harvard Theological Studies 14. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Rose, Charles Brian. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*. Cambridge Studies in Classical Art and Iconography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Röska-Hardy, Louise. "Metapher, Bedeutung und Verstehen." In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprache und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 138–50. Bern: Haupt, 1995.
- Rossell, William H. "New Testament Adoption—Graeco-Roman or Semitic." *JBL* 50 (1931): 186–200.

- Roth, John D. "The Complex Legacy of the *Martyrs Mirror* among Mennonites in North America." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 87.3 (2013): 277–316.
- Rubinstein, Lene. *Adoption in IV. Century Athens*. Opuscula Graecolatina 34. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1993.
- Rubinstein, Lene, et al. "Adoption in Hellenistic and Roman Athens." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 42 (1991): 139–51.
- Rumelhart, David E. "Some Problems with the Notion of Literal Meanings." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd Ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 71–82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Rusam, Dietrich. "Neue Belege zu den *stoicheia tou kosmou* (Gal 4,3.9, Kol 2,8.20)." *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119–25.
- Russell, Bertrand. *Logic and Knowledge: Essays 1901–1950*, ed. Charles Marsh. London: Allen & Unwin, 1956.
- Şahin, N. Eda Akyürek. "Eine neue Ehrung für den Kaiser Domitian aus Bursa." In *Euergetes: Festschrift für Pro. Dr. Haluk Abbasoğlu zum 65 Geburtstag*, ed. İnci Delemen, 79–81. Antalya: Suna-İnan Kiraç Akdeniz Medeniyetleri Araştırma Enstitüsü, 2008.
- Şahin, Sencer. *Bithynische Studien*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 7. Bonn: Habelt, 1978.
- Saller, Richard. "Patria Potestas and the Stereotype of the Roman Family." *Continuity and Change* 1 (1986): 7–22.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1902.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. New Testament Library. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Sarna, Nahum. *Exodus*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
- Sauer, Georg. *Jesus Sirach/Ben Sira*. Das Alte Testament deutsch Apokryphen 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Schachter, S., and J. Singer. "Cognitive Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional States." *Psychological Review* 69 (1962): 379–99.
- Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace, eds. *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Second Series, 14 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988–1991.
- Schelbert, Georg. *Abba Vater: Der literarische Befund vom Altaramäischen bis zu den späten Haggada-Werken*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 81. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 5. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1987.

- Schlatter, Adolf. *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 7. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an die Galater*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- Schneider, J. “στενάζω, στεναγμός, συστενάζω.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 7, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley 600–603. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- Schoenberg, Martin. “*Huiiothesia*: The Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites.” *AER* 143 (1960): 261–73.
- Scholtissek, Klaus. “‘Geboren aus einer Frau, geboren unter das Gesetz’ (Gal 4,4): die christologisch-soteriologische Bedeutung des irdischen Jesus bei Paulus.” In *Paulinische Christologie: exegetische Beiträge: Hans Hübner zum 70. Geburtstag*, eds. Udo Schnelle, and Thomas Söding, 194–219. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Scholz, Oliver R. “Wit und Regeln: Metaphern und ihre Auslegung in der Philosophie der Aufklärung.” In *Metapher und Innovation: Die Rolle der Metapher im Wandel von Sprach und Wissenschaft*, eds. Henri Lauener, Andreas Graeser, and Gerhard Seel, 39–52. Bern: Haupt, 1995.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. “Corporate and Individual Election in Romans 9: A Response to Brian Abasciano.” *JETS* 49 (2006): 373–86.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. “Does Romans 9 Teach Individual Election unto Salvation? Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections.” *JETS* 36 (1993): 25–40.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Paul: Apostle of God's Glory in Christ*. Downers Grove: IVP, 2001.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.
- Schulte-Middelich, Bern. “Funktionen intertextueller Textkonstitution.” In *Intertextualität: Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, eds. Ulrich Broich and Manfred Pfister, 197–242. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1985.
- Schüpphaus, Joachim. *Die Psalmen Salomos: Ein Zeugnis Jerusalemer Theologie und Frömmigkeit in der Mitte des vorchristlichen Jahrhunderts*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 7. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth. “Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians.” *NTS* 33 (1987): 386–403.
- Schweitzer, Eduard. “Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der ‘Sendungsformel’ Gal 4:4f. Rom 8:3f. Joh 3:16f. I Joh 4:9.” *ZNW* 57 (1966): 199–210.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zur Neuen Testament II 48. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

- Searle, John R. "Metaphor." In *Metaphor and Thought*, 2nd ed., ed. Andrew Ortony, 83–111. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Serge, Mario. *Iscrizioni di Cos*. Rome: Edizioni Quasar, 2007.
- Siebeneck, Robert. "The Midrash of Wisdom 10–19." *CBQ* 22 (1960): 176–82.
- Siebert, Folker. *Argumentation bei Paulus: gezeigt an Röm 9–11*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 34. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Skehan, Patrick, and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible Commentary. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smith, Martin. "Greek Adoptive Formulae." *Classical Quarterly* 17 (1967): 302–10.
- Snyder, C. Arnold. *Following in the Footsteps of Christ: The Anabaptist Tradition*. New York: Orbis Books, 2004.
- Söding, Thomas. "Verheissung und Erfüllung im Lichte paulinischer Theologie." *NTS* 47.2 (2001): 146–70.
- Sopory, Pradeep. "Metaphor and Intra-Attitudinal Structural Coherence." *Communication Studies* 59.2 (2008): 164–81.
- Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.
- Spencer, Aída Besançon. "Father-Ruler: The Meaning of the Metaphor 'Father' for God in the Bible." *JETS* 39.3 (1996): 433–42.
- Staley, Jeffrey. *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 82. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Stanton, Graham. *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Stanton, Graham. Review of *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context*, by Mark Nanos. *JTS* 56.2 (2005): 568–72.
- Steen, Gerard, and Raymond Gibbs, eds. *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics*. Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001.
- Stenschke, Cristoph. "Römer 9–11 als Teil des Römerbriefs." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 197–225. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Stern, Daniel. "The Art of Fiction LII: Bernard Malamud." *The Paris Review* 61 (1975): 41–64.
- Stienstra, Nelly. *YHWH Is the Husband of His People: Analysis of a Biblical Metaphor with Special Reference to Translation*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993.
- Stowers, Stanley. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Strecker, Georg. *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring. New York: De Gruyter, 2000.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, trans. Scott Hafemann. Louisville: WJK, 1994.

- Swartzentruber, A. Orley. "The Piety and Theology of the Anabaptist Martyrs in van Bracht's *Martyrs' Mirror*." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 28.2 (1954): 5–26.
- Tacitus, Cornelius. *Historiae*, 4 vols., trans. Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann, 1962–1963.
- Taylor, John. "The Eschatological Interdependence of Jews and Gentiles in Galatians." *TynBul* 63.2 (2012): 291–316.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press, 1975.
- Tegtmeyer, Hennig. "Der Begriff der Intertextualität und seine Fassungen: Eine Kritik der Intertextualitätskonzepte Julia Kristevas und Susanne Holthuis." In *Textbeziehungen: linguistische und literaturwissenschaftliche Beiträge zur Intertextualität*, ed. Josef Klein, 49–81. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag, 1997.
- Tennyson, Alfred. *Alfred Lord Tennyson: Selected Poetry*, ed. Norman Page. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Theobald, Michael. "Unterschiedliche Gottesbilder in Röm 9–11? Die Israel-Kapitel als Anfrage an die Einheit des theologischen Diskurses bei Paulus." In *The Letter to the Romans*, ed. Udo Schnelle, 135–77. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Theron, Daniel J. "'Adoption' in the Pauline Corpus." *EvQ* 28.1 (1956): 6–14.
- Thiessen, Henry. "The Place of Israel in the Scheme of Redemption: As Set Forth in Romans 9–11." *BSac* 98 (1941): 78–91.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The Promise of the Father: Jesus and God in the New Testament*. Louisville: WJK, 2000.
- Toit, Andreas B. du. "Forensic metaphors in Romans and Their Soteriological Significance." In *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, 213–46. Novum Testamentum Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tolmie, D. François. "Salvation as Redemption: The Use of 'Redemption' Metaphors in Pauline Literature." In *Salvation in the New Testament*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt, 247–269. Novum Testamentum Supplements 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Tonstad, Sigve. "The Revisionary Potential of 'Abba! Father' in the Letters of Paul." *AUSS* 45.1 (2007): 5–18.
- Trafton, Joseph. "Psalms of Solomon in Recent Research." *JSP* 6 (1994): 3–19.
- Trebilco, Paul. "Creativity at the Boundary: Features of the Linguistic and Conceptual Construction of Outsiders in the Pauline Corpus." *NTS* 60.2 (2014): 185–201.
- Trebilco, Paul. *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Trebilco, Paul. "What Shall We Call Each Other? Part One: The Issue of Self-Designations in the Pastoral Epistles." *TynBul* 53.2 (2002): 239–58.

- Trebilco, Paul. "Why Did the Early Christians Call Themselves ἡ ἐκκλησία?" *NTS* 57.3 (2011): 440–60.
- Trumper, Tim. "A Fresh Exposition of Adoption: An Outline." *SBET* 23.1 (2005): 60–80.
- Trumper, Tim. "An Historical Study of the Doctrine of Adoption in the Calvinistic Tradition." University of Edinburgh: Ph. D. Diss., 2001.
- Trumper, Tim. "The Metaphorical Import of Adoption: A Plea for Realisation I: The Adoption Metaphor in Biblical Usage." *SBET* 14 (1996): 129–45.
- Trumper, Tim. "The Theological History of Adoption I: An Account." *SBET* 20 (2002): 4–28.
- Trumper, Tim. "The Theological History of Adoption II: A Rationale." *SBET* 20 (2002): 177–202.
- Tsang, Sam. *From Slaves to Sons: A New Rhetoric Analysis on Paul's Slave Metaphors in His Letter to the Galatians*. Studies in Biblical Literature 81. New York: Peter Lang, 2005.
- Turbayne, Colin. *The Myth of Metaphor*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962.
- Turner, Mark. *Death is the Mother of Beauty: Mind, Metaphor, Criticism*. Christchurch, NZ: Cybereditions, 2000.
- Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Turretin, Francis. *The Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, trans. G. M. Giger, ed. J. T. Dennison Jr. Phillipsburg: P & R Publishing, 1994.
- "The Twelve Tables." In *Remains of Old Latin*, vol. 3, ed. E. H. Warmington, 424–515. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *The Drama of Doctrine: A Canonical-Linguistic Approach to Christian Theology*. Louisville: WJK, 2005.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text?: The Bible, the Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. "Wrighting the Wrongs of the Reformation: The State of the Union with Christ in St. Paul and Protestant Soteriology." In *Jesus, Paul, and the People of God: A Theological Dialogue with N. T. Wright*, eds. Nicholas Perrin and Richard B. Hays, 235–59. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2011.
- Vermes, Géza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. London: Collins, 1973.
- Vermes, Géza. *Jesus and the World of Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Wagner, J. Ross. "Not from the Jews Only, But Also from the Gentiles: Mercy to the Nations in Romans 9–11." In *Between Gospel and Election*, eds. Florian Wilk, and J. Ross Wagner, 417–31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Wahl, Harald-Martin. "Ester, das adoptierte Waisenkind: Zur Adoption im Alten Testament." *Bib* 80.1 (1999): 78–99.
- Walser, Andreas Victor. "ΘΥΓΑΤΡΟΘΕΣΙΑ—Ein Neues Zeignis aus Kaunos für die Adoption von Frauen." *EA* 37 (2004): 101–106.

- Walters, James C. "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance." In *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley, 42–76. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2003.
- Wartofsky, Marx. *Models: Representation and the Scientific Understanding*. Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science 48. London: Reidel, 1979.
- Wassenburg, S. I., and R. A. Zwaan. "Readers Routinely Represent Implied Object Rotation: The Role of Visual Experience." *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 63 (2010): 1665–1670.
- Watson, Edward. *Paul, His Roman Audience, and the Adopted People of God*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2008.
- Watson, Nigel. "And if Children, Then Heirs—Why Not Sons?" *ABR* 49 (2001): 53–56.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The Lutheran Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40–66*, trans. David M. G. Stalker. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- Wierzbecka, Anna. "Everyday Conceptions of Emotion: A Semantic Perspective." In *Everyday Conceptions of Emotion*, eds. James Russell (et al.), 17–45. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995.
- Williams, David. *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Winninge, Mikael. *Sinners and the Righteous: A Comparative Study of the Psalms of Solomon and Paul's Letters*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 26. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiskell, 1995.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *The Wittgenstein Reader*, ed. Anthony Kenny. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.
- Witulski, Thomas. *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 193. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.
- Wolde, Ellen van. "Trendy Intertextuality?" In *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel*, ed. Sipke Drasma, 43–49. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989.
- Wolter, Michael. "Das Israelprobleme nach Gal 4,21–31 und Röm 9–11." *ZTK* 107 (2010): 1–30.
- Woyke, Johannes. "Nochmals zu den 'schawchen und unfähigen Elementen' (Gal 4,9): Paulus, Philo und die στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου." *NTS* 54.2 (2008): 221–34.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Wright, N. T. *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

- Wright, Robert B. *The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 1. New York: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Wright, Robert B. "Psalms of Solomon." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 639–70. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Wright, Robert B. "The Psalms of Solomon, the Pharisees, and the Essenes." In *1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies and the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Seminar*, ed. Robert A. Kraft, 136–54. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Wright, Robert B., and V. Schwartz, "Psalms of Solomon: Theological Importance." In *OTP*, vol. 2, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 643–46. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Xenophon. *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*, vol. 4, trans. E. C. Marchant, and O. J. Todd. Loeb Classical Library 168. London: Heinemann, 1979.
- Zetterholm, Magnus. "Pre-Christian Jewish Messianism: An Overview." In *The Messiah in Early Judaism and Christianity*, xxi–xxviii. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Zhang, Peter. "Corporate Identity Metaphor as Constitutive Discourse in Miniature: The Case of New China Life." *ETC: A Review of General Semantics* 68.4 (2011): 375–394.
- Zwaan, R. A. "The Immersed Experiencer: Toward an Embodied Theory of Language Comprehension." In *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, vol 43, ed. B. H. Ross, 35–62. New York: Academic Press, 2004.

Index of Modern Authors

- Aasgaard, Reidar 3–5, 56, 108, 208, 209, 229, 235
- Abasciano, Brian J. 254, 259, 267, 298
- Aletti, J. N. 251
- Alkier, Stefan 271
- Andersen, Francis 280
- Anderson, H. 286
- Aranda, Antonio 6, 179
- Arnold, Clinton 158, 159
- Asano, Atsuhiko 104, 105, 197, 248
- Atkinson, Kenneth 291
- Austin, J. L. 76
- Auzépy, Marie-France 118, 145
- Aveyard, M. E. 85
- Barclay, John 184, 203, 281, 286
- Barr, James 117, 128, 162, 163
- Barsalou, L. W. 26, 27
- Barrett, C. K. 200, 203, 207, 219, 259, 306
- Bassler, Jouette 234
- Basson, Alec 3
- Bauckham, Richard 223, 224
- Baum, L. Frank 26, 27, 28
- Baur, F. C. 202
- Beale, Gregory 153
- Beardsley, Monroe 4, 47, 49, 50, 218
- Becker, Jürgen 168, 187, 188
- Beilock, S. L. 29
- Beker, J. Cristiaan 224, 231, 235, 236, 247, 312
- Belleville, Linda 159, 178
- Belth, Marc 48
- Bergen, Benjamin 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 37, 44, 47, 48, 60, 70, 79, 93, 94, 95, 98, 178, 190, 231, 232, 322
- Berkely, Bill 91
- Berner, Cristoph 274
- Betz, Hans Dieter 32, 60, 149, 154, 157, 167, 171, 179, 182, 193
- Binder, J. R. 47
- Bird, Michael 54, 55
- Black, Max 4, 26, 31, 32, 33, 34–40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 47, 49, 50, 70, 112, 145, 177, 222, 224, 225, 265, 266, 303
- Blanchard, A. A. 85
- Blum, Erhard 127
- Boer, Martinus de 149, 155, 156, 159, 167, 180, 182, 190
- Boers, Hendrikus 187
- Booth, Wayne 5, 6, 29, 30, 90, 91, 93, 94, 96, 191, 233, 238, 239, 310
- Bornet, Gérard 53
- Boyarin, Daniel 195
- Branick, Vincent 205, 229
- Brawley, Robert 63, 66, 128, 273, 294
- Brettler, Marc Zvi 3
- Breytenbach, Cilliers 149
- Broich, Ulrich 62, 63, 64
- Brown, Michael 118
- Brown, R. E. 204
- Brueggemann, Walter 274, 275, 277
- Burchard, C. 284
- Burke, Kenneth 87, 88
- Burke, Trevor 6, 7, 16–17, 21, 32, 46, 115, 133, 175, 177, 179, 196, 201, 211, 212, 215, 217, 218, 220, 221, 224, 225, 227, 229, 233, 240
- Burkett, Delbert 270
- Burri, Alex 71
- Buscemi, Alfio Marcello 6, 179, 180, 192
- Byrne, Brendan 7–8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 58, 63, 64, 115, 118, 122–126, 127, 128, 134, 206, 220, 221, 227, 229, 255, 257, 261, 263, 272, 280, 281, 285, 304, 305
- Bytwerk, Randall 90
- Campbell, Douglas 210
- Campbell, William 202
- Casey, Maurice 271
- Charlesworth, James 289
- Cheon, Samuel 281, 282
- Chesnutt, Randall 284, 285
- Childs, Brevard 274, 277, 278
- Cisneros, J. David 91, 306
- Clark, Herbert 97, 98, 102, 196, 197, 245, 303
- Clore, Gerald 91
- Coggins, Richard 66
- Cohen, Anthony 104
- Cohen, Ted 5, 6, 90, 93, 97, 106, 107, 188, 194, 195, 244, 309, 313, 314, 315, 316, 322
- Collins, Adela Yarbro 270, 271
- Collins, Alan 91

- Collins, John 270, 271, 283, 287, 290
 Collins, Raymond 89
 Conant, L. L. 47
 Cook, James 6
 Cooke, G. 270
 Corley, Kathleen 6, 21, 22
 Corstan, Thomas 171
 Craghan, John 288
 Cranfield, C. E. B. 200, 203, 207, 208, 211, 219,
 221, 257, 262, 266, 296, 306
 Cranford, Michael 254, 295, 308
 Curcó, Carmen 104
- Dahl, Nils 222
 Danneberg, Lutz 72
 Darr, John 33
 Das, A. Andrew 160
 Davidson, Donald 32, 38, 45, 68
 Davidson, Ivor 56
 Davies, Glenn 308
 Davies, W. D. 149
 Dawes, Gregory 3, 4, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51,
 52, 56, 58, 73, 112, 113, 173, 213, 216, 258,
 318
 Day, Linda 289
 Dayton, Wilber 206
 Debord, Pierre 119
 Derrida, Jacques 48
 Desai, R. H. 47
 deSilva, David 32
 Di Lella, Alexander 287
 Dillon, Richard 243
 Dixon, Suzanne 122, 140
 Dodd, C. H. 251
 Dunn, James 150, 163, 164, 167, 168, 177, 181,
 185, 186, 187, 193, 203, 204, 206, 207, 210,
 211, 212, 214, 217, 218, 219, 223, 225, 231,
 234, 237, 248, 252, 254, 259, 270, 271,
 298, 299, 300, 306, 307, 309, 312, 319
 Durham, Deborah 105
- Eastman, Susan 222, 252, 300
 Eckhardt, Benedikt 289
 Edwards, Elizabeth Gordon 206
 Eliot, T. S. 113, 114
 Elliott, Neil 202, 312, 315
 Embry, Brad 289
 Epp, Eldon 257, 298, 306
- Erickson, Millard 217
 Eyben, Emiel 139
- Fadiga, L. 26
 Fahy, T. 202
 Fauconnier, Gilles 209, 226
 Fee, Gordon 156, 167, 168, 180, 183, 196, 229
 Feldman, Louis 283
 Feldmeier, Reinhard 307
 Fernandez, James 79, 105
 Ferré, Frederick 77
 Firth, Simon 89, 105
 Fitzmyer, Joseph 202, 203, 206, 209, 211, 218,
 219, 220, 246, 257, 261, 270, 295
 Fowl, Stephen 156, 183, 198
 Freedman, David 280
 Fung, Ronald 122, 168
- Gallese, V. 26
 Garner, David 201, 218, 227, 263
 Gaventa, Beverly Roberts 3, 5-6, 76, 88, 101,
 106, 148, 194, 216, 244, 247, 252, 254, 313,
 314, 316
 Getty, Mary Ann 309
 Gheorghita, Radu 64
 Gianoulis, George 6
 Gibbs, Raymond, Jr. 80, 85, 91, 98, 99, 107,
 183, 194, 195, 198
 Glucksberg, Sam 102
 Godet, Frederic 264, 266
 Goodrich, John 168, 169, 171, 174
 Graeser, Andreas 72
 Gray, Allison 3, 148
 Green, Joel 94
 Gregg, J. A. F. 283
 Grindheim, Sigurd 288, 292, 297
 Grothe, Marty 37
 Grudem, Wayne 25, 217
 Gupta, Nijay 3-4, 56
 Grzybek, Erhard 119
- Haacker, Klaus 251, 261, 263
 Hallo, W. W. 64
 Hallof, Klaus 118, 120
 Hann, Robert 291
 Hansen, G. Walter 184, 185, 186, 196
 Hanson, Paul 270
 Harrison, A. R. W. 138

- Hays, Christopher B. 61, 62
 Hays, Richard 61, 62, 66, 89, 123, 148, 156, 157,
 158, 161, 166, 181, 182, 184, 187, 234, 268,
 295, 317, 318, 319
 Headlam, Arthur 210
 Heaton, E. W. 279, 302
 Heen, Erik 155
 Heim, Erin 72
 Hengel, Martin 271, 287
 Herrin, Elaine 162
 Herrmann, Peter 118, 120, 145
 Hirsch, Mary 37
 Hobbes, Thomas 33, 69
 Hodge, Caroline Johnson 7, 14–17, 116, 135,
 136, 143, 160, 174, 187, 202, 203, 215, 236,
 252, 315, 317, 319
 Hollander, John 294
 Holladay, William 278, 279
 Holthuis, Susanne 25, 62, 63, 64, 272
 Holt, L. E. 29
 Hooker, Morna 181, 182, 319
 Horbury, William 290
 Horton, William 78, 88, 89, 90, 97, 100, 103,
 244
 Howe, Bonnie 3, 88, 148
 Howgego, Christopher 145
 Huebner, Sabine 119
 Hugo, Victor 26
 Hurtado, Larry 270

 Jackson, Dave 108
 Jackson, Neta 108
 Jankovic, Rachel 99
 Jegher-Bucher, Verena 152
 Jenkins, Richard 104
 Jeremias, Joachim 162, 163, 164
 Jewett, Paul 87
 Jewett, Robert 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207,
 211, 214, 219, 220, 227, 234, 237, 245, 247,
 300, 305, 306, 307, 309, 310
 Johnson, Joel 80, 88
 Johnson, Mark 3, 4, 5, 24, 32, 36, 47, 49,
 52, 53, 70, 78, 80, 81, 89, 233, 303, 306,
 322
 Joseph, Simon 271
 Jüncker, Gunther 156, 300

 Kahl, Brigitte 13, 150, 151, 152, 153, 184
 Kaiser, Otto 287

 Kammler, Hans-Christian 257, 261
 Kaschak, M. P. 85
 Käsemann, Ernst 207, 225, 260, 262
 Katz, Albert 98
 Keesmaat, Sylvia 166, 168, 169
 Keysar, Boaz 102
 Kim, Johann 310
 Kirk, J. R. Daniel 230
 Koch, Dietrich-Alex 300
 Köller, Wilhelm 70, 90
 Kooten, George van 153
 Kövecses, Zoltán 78, 92–95, 188, 191, 192,
 238, 241, 242, 310, 311, 322
 Kraemer, Ross Shephard 283, 284
 Kraftchick, Steven 243
 Kremers, Heinz 252
 Krieger, Norbert 202
 Kristeva, Julia 25, 62, 63, 64
 Kroeger, Catherine Clark 25
 Kuiken, Don 91, 93
 Kunst, Christiane 118, 119, 120, 121, 141, 142,
 143, 144, 174, 305
 Kurylowicz, Marek 140

 Lakoff, George 3, 4, 5, 32, 36, 37, 41, 47, 49,
 52, 53, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 89, 183,
 227, 233, 303, 306, 308, 322
 Lampe, Peter 214
 Lanham, Richard 80, 179
 Larcati, Arturo 33
 Lewis, Robert 7, 12, 13, 14, 58, 139, 142, 144,
 215
 Lietzmann, H. 202
 Lightfoot, J. B. 167, 168
 Lindsay, Shane 85
 Liubinskas, Susann 199
 Llamas, Carmen 79
 Locke, John 33, 69
 Løland, Hanne 3, 148
 Longenecker, Bruce 172, 184, 252, 300, 308,
 309, 319
 Longenecker, Richard 122, 154, 155, 156, 158,
 159, 160, 168, 170, 171, 184, 186, 188, 190,
 204
 Lowry, James 109
 Lundbom, Jack 278
 Lütgert, Wilhem 154
 Lyall, Francis 6, 57, 58, 77, 115, 135, 136, 138,
 167

- Maartens, P. J. 304
 Macky, Peter 30, 41, 45, 50, 51, 56
 Madden, C. J. 85
 Malamud, Bernard 1
 Malay, Hasan 118, 120
 Mano, Q. R. 47
 Martinich, A. P. 46, 47, 67, 70
 Matera, Frank 167, 168, 170
 Marböck, Johannes 287
 Marshall, I. Howard 206
 Martin, Dale 217
 Martyr, J. Louis 60, 149, 154, 155, 156, 158,
 159, 167, 168, 170, 176, 177, 180, 184, 185,
 186, 195, 206, 207, 309
 Matlock, Teenie 80
 Mawhinney, Allen 77, 163, 164
 Mayes, A. D. H. 275
 McConville, J. G. 276
 McFague, Sallie 56, 71, 72, 79, 86, 87, 256
 Meeks, Wayne 153
 Meier, John 204
 Meinhold, Arndt 271
 Mettinger, Tryggve 270
 Metzger, Bruce 209
 Miall, David 91, 93
 Michel, Otto 253
 Middendorp, Theophil 287
 Mitchell, Jon 104
 Mitchell, Stephen 149, 171
 Moffat, James 149
 Moloney, Francis 65
 Montefiore, Claude 162
 Moo, Douglas 200, 203, 205, 206, 211, 219,
 220, 221, 223, 231, 236, 237, 244, 248, 262,
 263, 296, 299, 306
 Moore, Carey 288
 Morgan, Gareth 303
 Morris, Leon 65, 234, 264
 Mowinckel, Sigmund 280
 Moyise, Steve 64
 Müller-Richter, Klaus 33
 Munck, Johannes 154, 202, 203, 261
 Mundhenk, Norman 6
 Murray, John 217, 259, 262, 296, 306

 Nanos, Mark 116, 152, 153, 154, 155, 202, 203
 Neisser, U. 27
 Nelson, Richard 277

 Neusner, Jacob 63, 271
 Nickelsburg, George 270
 Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm 254
 Nietzsche, Friedrich 48
 Nigro, G. 27

 Oakes, Peter 155
 O'Brien, Gerald 84, 87
 O'Dell, Jerry 291
 Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko 105
 Omanson, Roger 209
 Ortony, Andrew 91
 Orwell, George 51
 Osborne, Grant 205, 211, 225
 Overland, Paul 271
 Owen, Paul 270

 Parker, Trent 93
 Pascal, Blaise 43, 44, 49, 67, 68, 69
 Pasoli, Elio 144
 Pecher, D. 27
 Peppard, Michael 6, 7, 10–12, 15, 20, 119, 122,
 139, 140, 143, 144, 170, 215, 227, 228, 235,
 269, 270
 Pesch, Rudolf 237
 Petrus, Klaus 72
 Pfister, Manfred 61, 62
 Piper, John 86–88, 253, 333
 Porter, Stan 270
 Powery, Emerson 243

 Quesnel, Michel 242
 Quinn, Naomi 81

 Rad, Gerhard von 275, 276
 Reasoner, Mark 251
 Reddy, Michael 89
 Reinbold, Wolfgang 251, 252
 Rey, Bernard 6
 Richards, I. A. 4, 33, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 52, 81,
 173
 Riel, Marijana 118, 120, 171
 Ricoeur, Paul 31, 66, 67, 68
 Ridderbos, Herman 65, 217
 Riesner, Rainer 149
 Riffaterre, Michael 63
 Ritchie, David 102
 Rizzolatti, G. 26

- Roetzel, Calvin 253
 Ropes, James 154
 Rose, Charles 145
 Röska-Hardy, Louise 53, 76
 Russell, William 6
 Roth, John 110
 Rubinstein, Lene 135, 136, 137, 138
 Rumelhart, David 73
 Russell, Bertrand 69

 Şahin, N. Eda Akyürek 120
 Şahin, Sencer 171
 Saller, Richard 139
 Sanday, William 210
 Sanders, E. P. 271
 Sarna, Nahum 274
 Sauer, Georg 287
 Schachter, S. 91
 Schelbert, Georg 162, 164
 Schell, Char 102
 Schlatter, Adolf 184, 260
 Schlier, Heinrich 187, 206, 223, 230, 245, 259, 264
 Schneider, J. 242
 Schoenberg, Martin 6
 Scholz, Oliver 69
 Schreiner, Thomas 200, 203, 205, 206, 211, 217, 220, 225, 246, 253, 259, 298
 Schulte-Middelich, Bern 62
 Schüssler Fiorenza, Elisabeth 33
 Schwartz, V. 289, 290
 Schweitzer, Eduard 157
 Scott, James 7–10, 12, 15, 20, 21, 57, 58, 63, 77, 115, 118, 119, 127–129, 131–133, 136, 142, 168, 169, 171, 173, 175, 208, 214, 224, 225, 227, 229, 255, 258, 260, 261, 264, 270, 280, 292, 304, 305
 Searle, John 30, 52, 61
 Seidenberg, M. S. 47
 Serge, Mario 118
 Siebeneck, Robert 281
 Siegert, Folker 253
 Singer, J. 91
 Skehan, Patrick 287
 Smith, Martin 119–121
 Snyder, C. Arnold 110
 Sopory, Pradeep 91, 93

 Soskice, Janet Martin 3, 4, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 39, 40–42, 43, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 71, 72, 73, 74, 81, 90, 114, 164, 165, 172, 173, 175, 210, 213, 216, 227, 248, 254, 255, 258, 321, 322
 Spencer, Aída Besançon 85
 Staley, Jeffrey 33
 Stanton, Graham 155
 Steen, Gerard 80
 Stenschke, Cristoph 251
 Stern, Daniel 1
 Stienstra, Nelly 3
 Stowers, Stanley 15, 116, 126, 128, 203, 252, 315
 Strecker, Georg 217
 Stuhlmacher, Peter 264, 307, 308
 Swartzentruber, A. Orley 110

 Taylor, John 158, 161, 165, 166
 Taylor, Lily Ross 144
 Taylor, Shelley 80, 88
 Tegtmeier, Hennig 25, 63
 Tennyson, Alfred 42, 112, 113
 Theobald, Michael 299
 Theron, Daniel 6
 Therriault, D. J. 85
 Thiessen, Henry 308
 Thiselton, Anthony 59
 Thompsom, Marianne Meye 229
 Toit, Andreas du 217
 Tolmie, D. François 217
 Tonstad, Sigve 228, 246
 Trafton, Joseph 289
 Trebilco, Paul 153, 218, 227, 235, 245, 314, 315
 Trumper, Tim 6, 56, 201, 218
 Tsang, Sam 166
 Turbayne, Colin 48
 Turner, Mark 4, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 183, 209, 226, 227, 233, 303, 308, 322
 Turner, Victor 79, 82, 105
 Turretin, Francis 332, 333

 Vanhoozer, Kevin 32, 68, 89, 333
 Vermes, Géza 162, 163

 Wagner, J. Ross 299
 Wahl, Harald-Martin 127

- Walser, Andreas Victor 21
Walters, James 6, 125, 136, 137, 141, 170, 171,
174, 197, 214, 215, 228
Wampler, Karen 93
Wartofsky, Max 71
Wassenburg, S. I. 29
Watson, Nigel 6
Watt, Dominic 79
Westerholm, Stephen 185
Westermann, Claus 278
Wheeler, Kathryn 27
Wierzbecka, Anna 91
Williams, David 54
Winninge, Mikael 289
Witherington, Ben, III 32
Wittgenstein, Ludwig 69
Witulski, Thomas 149
Wolde, Ellen van 62
Wolter, Michael 251
Wright, N. T. 186, 318, 319, 330, 333
Wright, Robert 289, 290, 291
Yaxley, R. H. 85
Zeelenberg, R. 27
Zetterholm, Magnus 270
Zhang, Peter 83, 106, 107, 198, 233, 248, 304,
316
Zwaan, R. A. 28, 29, 85

Index of Ancient Sources

1 Old Testament

Genesis

5:2	86
6:2	270
6:4	273 n. 75
12:1–2	260
12:2–9	257
15	256
15:5–7	257
17:1–14	260
17:1–27	256
17:4–8	257
19:14	95
38:8	132
38:15	95
48:5–6	9

Exodus

2:10	9, 131, 132
4:22	10, 132, 133, 255, 259, 260, 261, 262, 273, 274, 279, 287, 293, 295, 296, 301, 308
4:22–23	260, 274
12:25–26	257
16:1–36	65
16:7–10	255 n. 16
16:10	256
19:5–6	256
19:16–20	259
20:1–21	259
24:15–17	256
24:16–17	255 n. 16
29:43	256
40:34–35	256

Leviticus

9:6	255 n. 16
9:23	256

Numbers

14:10	255 n. 16, 256
16:19	255 n. 16

Deuteronomy

1:31	133 n. 73
5:24	255 n. 16

8:5	132, 133, 164, 259, 262, 274, 275, 279, 291, 293
14:1	132, 164, 262, 275, 276, 279
14:1–2	259, 279, 280
15:15	331
24:18	331
25:5–6	132, 133
25:9–10	132
32:5	276
32:5–6	133, 279, 293
32:5–9	293
32:6	164, 276
32:6–20	283
32:9	277
32:13	86
32:18	86, 276
32:19–21	280
32:20	277, 279, 280
32:21	277, 308 n. 201

Joshua

21:27	257
-------	-----

Ruth

4:17	132
------	-----

1 Samuel

4:21–22	242 n. 171, 255 n. 16
---------	-----------------------

2 Samuel

7:14	8–10, 20, 58, 127–129, 132–133, 168, 169, 173 n. 113, 258, 261, 270
12:1–7	93, 94
23:5	256

1 Kings

8:11	255 n. 16
------	-----------

1 Chronicles

16:35	217
22:10	270
28:13	257

2 Chronicles

5:14	255 n. 16, 256
7:1	256
7:1–3	255 n. 16

Esther

2:7 9
2:15 9

Job

1:6 270
13:16 268 n. 60
38:7 270

Psalms

2:7 132, 133, 258, 270
19 242 n. 171
78:24 65
22:9–11 86
29:1 270
68:5 163
89:27 297
97:6 255 n. 16
102:15–16 255 n. 16
103:13 163

Proverbs

3:11–12 132, 133, 270
3:12 133, 163, 291

Isaiah

1:2 164, 262, 276 n. 90
4:5 255 n. 16
6:3 255 n. 16
10:22–23 300
14:6 311
30:1 279
30:1–11 277, 279, 280, 293
31:5 51
40:5 255 n. 16
43:1 278
43:1–7 283
43:2–4 278
43:3–7 280
43:5–6 278
43:6–7 132, 133, 277, 278, 279
45:9–12 86
51:4–5 268 n. 60
52:10 268 n. 60
60:1 255 n. 16
63:7–8 164, 278
63:8 262, 279
63:9 278

63:10 278
63:16 134
64:8 278
65:1 308 n. 201

Jeremiah

31:7–10 293, 296, 302
31:9 132–133, 134, 164, 262, 278,
280, 287, 295, 296

Ezekiel

1:28 255 n. 16
3:12 255 n. 16
3:23 255 n. 16
8:4 255 n. 16
9:3 255 n. 16
10:4–19 255 n. 16
11:22–23 255 n. 16
34 109
34:11–16 255
43:2–5 255 n. 16

Hosea

1:1–2:1 299
1:6–9 279
2:1 9, 133, 261, 262, 279, 280,
285 n. 124, 293, 299, 300
2:2–3 255
2:4–5 255
2:21–23 299
11:1 10
11:1–4 86, 133 n. 73
11:4 51

Habakkuk

3:3 255 n. 16

Malachi

1:6 133, 164, 259, 276 n. 90
2:10 133, 278
3:16–17 262
3:17 133

2 Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**Judith**

9:12–14 134, 288, 293

Wisdom of Solomon

2:12	270
2:18	270
2:16	163
5:5	270
12:19–22	134, 281–282, 293
16:24–26	281 n. 112
18:1–4	134, 281–283, 293
18:13	134, 296

Sirach

4:10	270
23:4	163
33:20–24	235 n. 151
36:3	287
36:4	287
36:11	134
36:15–17	287
36:16–17	134, 287, 295, 296
36:17	288, 296
49:8	255 n. 16
51:10	134

Baruch

5:6–9	255 n. 16
-------	-----------

2 Maccabees

2:8	255 n. 16
6:23	257 n. 23

2 Esdras

6:58	296
------	-----

3 Maccabees

2.2–20	286
2.31–33	286 n. 128
3.4–7	286 n. 128
5.7	286
5.13–15	286 n. 128
6.2–15	286
6.4	163
6.27–28	134, 286
7.6	134, 286, 293
7.6–7	286
7.10–12	286 n. 128

4 Maccabees

5.35	257 n. 23
10.11	311
17.16	257 n. 23

Apocalypse of Abraham

2.1	270
-----	-----

1 Enoch

6.2	270 n. 65
13.8	270 n. 65
69.4–5	270
71.1	270
106.5	270

Joseph and Aseneth

1.4–6	285
1.5	285
2.1	285
6.3	271
6.5	284 n. 123
7.8	285
8.5–11	284 n. 122
9.1	284 n. 122
10.12–17	284 n. 122
11.3–5	284 n. 122
11.4–6	285
11.16–18	284 n. 122
12.5–15	284 n. 122
12.12–14	285
13.1	285
13.10	271
13.13–14	284 n. 123
14.9–10	284 n. 123
15.7	285 n. 124
16.8	271
18.11	284 n. 123
19.5	284 n. 122
19.6	285 n. 124
19.8	134, 284, 285, 293
21.3	270
21.4	284 n. 123, 285, 293

Prayer of Joseph

6–8	270
-----	-----

History of the Rechabites

5.4	270
-----	-----

Jubilees

19.29	134
47.5	131

Testament of Abraham

12.5	270
------	-----

Psalms of Solomon

3.11–12	290
13.9	296
13.9–12	290
15.10–13	290
17	302 n. 180
17.14	291
17.22	291
17.23	291
17.26–29	134, 290, 293
17.26–32	290, 298 n. 165
17.28–30	291
17.29	291
17.32	291
17.44–45	291
18.1–4	293, 295, 296
18.4	134, 293, 296
18.4–5	291, 301
18.5	290

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

T. Levi	
4.2–4	270

3 New Testament**Matthew**

6:9	163
6:24	117 n. 15
11:25	163
12:34	192
13:27	117 n. 15
13:24–30	93 n. 68
13:31–32	93 n. 68
13:44–50	93 n. 68
17:25	95
20:8	171
26:42	163

Mark

7:21	192
14:36	163

Luke

1:3	95
7:2	117 n. 15
8:3	171
10:21	163

10:29	95
10:30–37	94, 95
11:2	163
12:42	171
13:32	84
15:1–7	95
15:4	96
15:8–10	95
15:11–31	95
15:11–32	235 n. 151
15:32	96
21:14	192
23:34	163
23:46	163

John

1:14	292
1:18	292
3:16	292
3:18	292
6:31	65
6:35	65
6:41	65
6:49	65
6:53	66
6:58	65
8:35	117 n. 15
10:11–18	81, 109
11:33	92
11:41	163
12:27–28	163
14:1	192
15:15	117, 118
16:22	192
17:1–25	163

Acts

7:23	192
7:25	217

Romans

1:1	35, 117, 118
1:3–4	9
1:4	20
1:5	202
1:13	202
1:16	176, 203, 234, 297 n. 162
1:16–17	268 n. 60

1:24	192	8:14-15	231
2:11-16	234	8:14-17	15, 21 n. 109, 239
2:12	329	8:15	1, 13, 20, 39, 134, 157, 160, 164, 165, 188, 189, 200 n. 1, 206, 209 n. 48, 210, 211, 213-222, 225, 227-230, 239-246, 248, 253, 266, 296, 306, 312, 324-326
2:15	192	8:15-17	215, 240
2:25-29	103, 106, 203	8:15-23	16, 23, 204, 207, 230, 232, 262, 320, 327, 328
2:28-29	234	8:15-39	20
3:9	234	8:16	246
3:9-19	234	8:16-17	21 n. 109, 225
3:19-20	234	8:17	9, 210, 223, 228, 230, 234, 239, 240, 242, 324
3:23	329	8:18	229, 239
3:24	330	8:18-21	231
3:29-30	203, 234	8:18-23	240
3:30	234	8:18-25	221-224
4:1	257	8:19	216
4:1-25	130, 260	8:19-22	225
4:9	234	8:21	239
4:11-12	203, 234	8:22	56, 216
4:13	257, 260	8:22-23	215
4:14	260	8:23	1, 13, 39, 157, 165, 205, 209, 211-216, 220, 221, 222, 225-231, 234, 239, 240, 243, 245, 248, 249, 253, 266, 296, 306, 312, 324, 325, 326, 330
4:16	260	8:23-25	225, 229
4:16-17	257	8:26-27	224, 239, 240
4:18	260	8:28	240
4:19	130	8:29	20, 108, 230, 235, 236, 292, 295, 296
5:12-21	234	8:32	9
5:16	329	9-11	8, 251, 252, 255, 263, 266, 267, 295, 301, 304, 307, 308 n. 201, 315 n. 223, 317, 319
6:6-7	107	9:1-3	252, 325
6:6-20	329	9:1-5	251, 252 n. 5, 254, 263, 264, 266, 267 n. 56, 310, 311
6:16-17	117 n. 15	9:2	295, 309
6:16-18	331	9:4	1, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 39, 124, 130, 132, 157, 160,
6:17	35		
7:14	329		
8:1	234, 238		
8:1-28	238		
8:3	238		
8:4	238, 239		
8:4-9	206, 222		
8:5	239		
8:5-17	210, 238		
8:6	238		
8:6-7	231, 238		
8:9	238, 239, 246		
8:10	238		
8:12	218, 222		
8:12-13	241		
8:12-15	242		
8:12-17	206, 238		
8:12-25	222-224, 248		
8:12-29	208, 209		

Romans (cont.)

	236 n. 153, 237, 251, 253, 254, 257–269, 272, 273, 281, 292–308, 309 n. 203, 311–320, 324, 325, 326, 328
9:4–5	160 n. 56, 261, 267
9:5	257 n. 24
9:6	254, 298, 300
9:6–8	309
9:6–9	298
9:6–13	203
9:6–17	60
9:6–18	309
9:8	267
9:9	130, 298
9:11	298
9:11–12	298
9:11–18	301
9:16	60, 294, 298
9:20–22	255
9:24	234, 298, 299, 301
9:24–26	302
9:24–28	298, 299
9:25	300 n. 176
9:25–26	267
9:25–28	301
9:26	299, 301 n. 179, 319
9:27	301 n. 179, 302
9:27–28	300
9:27–29	302
9:31–33	309
10:1	176
10:12	234
10:20	319
11:1–6	302
11:1–12	309
11:5–7	203
11:7	302
11:11	176
11:13	202, 203
11:13–24	203
11:17	319
11:17–24	252, 255, 267, 307
11:26	300
11:28–29	302
11:28–32	301
11:29	313
11:32	234

12:4–8	78
13:11	176
14	204
14:1–12	234
15:7–13	234
15:14–19	202

1 Corinthians

1:23	107
3:1–3	21
3:10–15	107
4:14	108
4:18	92
6:11	107
9:24–26	59, 60, 294
10:6	192
12:12–31	78

2 Corinthians

1:6	176
4:6–7	78
6:2	176, 217
6:13	108
7:2–3	192
7:10	176
9:7	192

Galatians

1:2	153
1:6–7	155
2:1–15	150
2:12	152
2:14–16	152
2:19	184, 190
2:20	107, 110
3:1	184
3:2	179, 184, 190
3:5	190
3:6	152
3:6–9	130, 155
3:6–29	260
3:7	156, 169, 180, 187
3:8	152
3:10–11	152
3:13	152
3:13–14	182, 184
3:14	180, 260
3:15–18	155

3:15-4:7	166
3:16	152, 187, 260
3:16-18	130
3:17-19	260
3:17-21	130
3:18	260
3:19	260
3:21-22	260
3:23	158, 159
3:23-29	155, 166 n. 82
3:24-25	158
3:25-29	180
3:26	187, 260
3:26-29	172
3:27	190
3:28	21, 167
3:29	166, 167, 169, 187, 260
4:1-3	161, 166 n. 82, 167, 169, 174, 185
4:1-7	9, 15, 158, 159, 160, 161, 166-183, 188, 189, 190, 191, 193, 197, 238, 240, 249
4:1-9	159, 160, 185
4:3	158, 159, 167, 185
4:3-6	182
4:4	20, 167, 170, 181
4:4-5	54, 156, 157, 158, 159, 165, 181, 182, 184, 186, 189
4:5	1, 13, 16, 20, 23, 39, 54, 56, 149, 150, 151, 157, 158, 160, 162, 164-166, 168, 173-85, 188, 189, 193, 194, 195 n. 204, 197, 198, 199, 249, 323-328
4:5-6	162
4:5-7	165, 166, 167, 180, 193
4:6	134, 158, 160, 161, 164, 182, 190, 191, 192, 205
4:9	159
4:19	101, 108
4:21-31	130, 152, 155
4:28-31	180
5:2-3	103, 106
5:7	59, 60, 294
5:12	155
6:12-13	155
6:13-15	103, 106
6:17	110

Ephesians

1:5	1 n.3, 16
2:11	103, 106
2:11-12	99
2:14	99
3:17	192
5:21-33	4
5:23	25 n. 3

Philippians

1:19	176 n. 125, 268 n. 60
1:28	176
2:12	176
3:2-3	103, 106

Colossians

1:15	292
1:18	292
2:11-15	103, 106
3:15	192

1 Thessalonians

2:7	21, 101, 108
2:11	108
5:8	176

1 Timothy

1:2	108
5:24	329

2 Timothy

2:24	117 n. 16, 118
4:6	82, 83, 110
4:6-7b	83 n. 25

Titus

1:4	108
-----	-----

Hebrews

1:6	292
11:7	217

James

3:6-10	84
3:14	192

1 John

4:9	292
-----	-----

Revelation

1:5	292
5:6	51
15:3	117 n. 16

4 Other Ancient Literature**Aristotle***Catagoriae*

1.16a 3	41
---------	----

Poetica

1457b 6–9	30
-----------	----

Politica

1255b35–37	171
------------	-----

Rhetorica

1411b	51
-------	----

Cicero*De domo suo*

34–38	141 n. 105
-------	------------

Demosthenes*Private Orations XLI–XLIX*

44.23	119 n. 24
44.26	119 n. 24
44.34	119 n. 24
46.14	137

Dio Cassius*Roman History*

69.20	235 n. 151
-------	------------

Diodorus of Sicily

XXXI 26.4	121
-----------	-----

Gaius*Institutiones*

1.55	140
2.136	143
2.137	143

Gellius*Attic Nights*

5.19	141
5.19.5–6	142
5.19.9	139

Gregory of Nyssa*On the Making of Man*

16.14	86 n. 34
-------	----------

Isaeus

2.10	119 n. 24
3.60	119 n. 24
6.22	119 n. 24
6.44	138
6.63	136
7.1	136
7.15–16	121
7.25	138
9.7	119 n. 24
10.9	119 n. 24

Josephus*Antiquities*

1.154	131
2.232	131

Justinian*Digesta*

1.7.23	141
1.7.38	144

Institutiones Justiniani

1.11.4	141
1.20.6	170 n. 98
1.22	170

Philo*De confusione linguarum*

145–47	271
--------	-----

De Vita Mosis

1.19	131
------	-----

De specialibus legibus

1.318	271
-------	-----

Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin

1.91	270
------	-----

Plato*Laws*

5.792c	137 n. 84
--------	-----------

Plutarch*De fraterno amore*

488a 235 n. 150

Quintilian*Institutio oratoria*

VIII.vi.8 31

Seneca

1.6.6 143

Tacitus*Annales*

1.14 145 n. 135

12.25–69 235 n. 151

The Twelve Tables

4.2 142 n. 113

Xenophon*Memorabilia*

2.3.5–18 235 n. 151